

THE
LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1900.

ARTICLE I.

THE ETHICS OF HERBERT SPENCER,

By T. B. STORK, A. M.

It is said that a picture of the great Apelles was once well criticized by a humble shoemaker who remarked in it an ill drawn shoe.

In like manner perhaps it may be permissible for us to pass in review the ethical system which the great Apostle of Evolution has so elaborately, so clearly—and shall we say also so prolixly?—developed in the *Data of Ethics* and its companion volumes.

Briefly summarized the system presents us with this test of right and wrong conduct: Agreeable sensations. Mr. Spencer says: "Using then as our tests those most pronounced forms of good and bad conduct we find it unquestionable that our ideas of their goodness or badness really originate from our consciousness of the certainty or probability that they will produce pleasure or pain somewhere."*

The term "agreeable and disagreeable sensations" is adopted here advisedly as the equivalent of the pleasure and pain which Mr. Spencer makes the test of conduct. Necessarily all the pleasure or pain, good or evil, with which he deals must be based on sensations agreeable or disagreeable. The river cannot rise higher than its source, and the system which starts with the conduct of an oyster or other animal and tests all conduct

**Principles of Ethics*, Vol. I., D. Appleton & Co., 1897, p. 32.

by the pleasure or pain experienced by the animal creation from the lowest forms up to man himself, must mean by pleasure or pain that feeling directly or indirectly based on sensations received by the bodily organs, the eye, the ear, the palate, and so on and nothing else. It cannot for one moment be supposed that the distinguished author would be guilty, without notice, of a change of meaning in his terms at any point of the argument. Nor can it with any greater show of fairness be inferred that the pleasure or pain, of which he treats when dealing with the conduct of men and with egoistic and altruistic pleasures and their reconciliations, can possibly have any existence or reality except such as in the last analysis bases itself on agreeable sensations—the pleasures of and through the senses. No matter how silver or golden the head of his statue, it must stand, if it stand at all, on the feet of clay with which he started, agreeable sensations.

Take away agreeable sensations, destroy the organs of the senses, and the most sublimated of altruistic pleasures must perish; for it is only through sympathy and its concomitant, a representation of the agreeable sensations produced in one's own senses, that there is enjoyed the altruistic pleasure of beholding or knowing of the agreeable sensations of another.

The significance of the foregoing observations is made manifest when the author comes to treat of other systems of Ethics. Arguing that all ethical systems agree, that the justification for life turns on the issue whether pleasurable or painful feelings predominate, he proceeds to remark: "Changing the venue cannot alter the verdict. * * * And for either to regard animate existence as a blessing if here its pains were held to exceed its pleasures, he must hold that hereafter its pleasures will exceed its pains * * * so implying that life is a blessing and not a curse we are inevitably asserting that conduct is good or bad according as its total effects are pleasurable or painful."*

That is to say, being interpreted, having started with the general proposition that conduct is good in an oyster or a man, which affords pleasurable feelings or sensations, we are now

**Principles of Ethics*, Vol. I., D. Appleton & Co., 1897, p. 28.

asked to say that those ethical systems which make the pleasurable feelings to be enjoyed in the next world as the justification, for life in this, are practically on the same plane; and that the logical position of the man who says life can only be justified on the ground of good to be obtained in the next world is the same as that of the man who says life is only justified by the good to be obtained in this world. In other words that the good of the next world and the good of this world are identical: material good and spiritual good are the same things, or in a different form that there is no spiritual good as distinguished from material good.

We do not lose sight of the argument that no matter what the kind of good meant, spiritual or material, the fact remains that it is always some sort of good that is presented as the reason for and justification of life. So far the confusion of the two goods is not destructive of Mr. Spencer's reasoning. But it will be disputed by none that all ethical systems worthy of the name always present good of some sort as the object and reason for conduct. The real dispute is on this very matter, what kind of good, what sort of good, is presented, is it the material good of Mohamet's Paradise, the good of agreeable sensations, or is it the spiritual good of Christ's heavenly kingdom?

Here we have a confusion of the two goods that is inexcusable: in the first place it is inaccurate, for previously the discussion had been of agreeable sensations, from those of the oyster up, and the proposition was put forward that those agreeable sensations made conduct that tended to produce them good in animals and men. But when we come to deal with the good of the next world we are bound to take notice that in the passage thither, in death, so far as we know anything of it, all sensations agreeable or otherwise, must cease with the destruction of those bodily organs which alone are the instruments of sensation. Indeed before death it sometimes happens, through the partial death which we call decrepitude of the various organs, all sensation ceases, so that so far as we know anything we must know that agreeable sensations or feelings, the material pleasurable feelings of the body are impossible after death, the very organs

and whole body being destroyed and with them the sources of all these sensations. So that for this reason and on the basis of the scientific reasoning which Mr. Spencer himself puts forward the comparison of the two goods, that of this and that of the next world is, to say the very least, unjustifiable.

But again and logically it is inexcusable, because the systems antagonistic to his own to which he refers, expressly draws the distinction between the material and the spiritual good and contrast the two as opposite and not identical. This of course does not establish the distinction as real and true, but it certainly precludes Mr. Spencer from assuming that the identity of the two is conceded.

Changing the venue therefore does not alter the verdict. Indeed it may be said to bring the pleadings to the real issue, the vital dispute between the two great ethical systems, the Christian and the Spencerian.

The good which justifies conduct in the Christian system is one which is independent of agreeable sensations and of all material conditions. It is a state of consciousness variously and imperfectly described as peace with God, spiritual happiness, or blessedness, consciousness of Divine approval, and so on, but a state that has as its outward badge an independence of all physical conditions. Every other good known to man depends on these: this alone is superior to and even grows stronger under the spur of physical suffering. Were it not superfluous, innumerable instances might be cited: the deaths of the ancient martyrs, the daily lives of invalids, all attest the existence of this state of consciousness whose happiness is independent of physical conditions.

Nor is it any shadowy unsubstantial dream of the poet or philosopher, it is as positive and real and as capable of definition as any good of the other system. Like all other goods, whether based on agreeable sensations or otherwise, to know it, it must be experienced. The simplest agreeable sensation is indescribable to one who has not experienced it, the pleasure obtained from drinking a glass of cool water would be impossible of description without the aid of experience, save by the most

imperfect and most unsatisfactory circumlocution. Without the verification of experience its very existence might well be doubted.

In this respect the spiritual good of the Christian system stands on the same basis as the agreeable sensation of the Spencerian: both depend on experience for their ultimate demonstration, and independent of experience both are equally difficult of proof. When, however, we come to compare them further by the two tests to which every system of ethics must appeal, the superiority of the Christian system shines forth as the light of day to a flickering candle flame. These two tests are, first the certainty of the theoretical truth of the system, and secondly the certainty of its application to practical affairs, its ability to solve correctly and surely the problems of every day conduct.

And first, as to its theoretical truth the Christian system carries this high assurance. It calls to witness consciousness itself. It is as conclusive as Des Cartes's *Cogito Ergo sum*; for it declares that to the man who follows the Christian precepts, regulates his conduct by Christ's teaching as embodied in these two rules, 'Love God and thy neighbor as thyself,' there will come the assurance that he is doing God's will, that his conduct is right absolutely without peradventure or shadow of doubt. No man can doubt the assurance thus delivered by consciousness, for such doubt is suicidal, it is a contradiction in terms.

If it be objected that this assurance may be an error of delusion of the particular consciousness which experiences it, that such an assurance is merely subjective with possibly no objective reality corresponding to it, the answer is that the whole question of right and wrong is subjective and not objective in the aspect which we are now considering. There is no absolute right and wrong except that which concerns the individual and him alone. That assurance is given him as a guide as an individual, it does not, it cannot from its very nature, justify his conduct to others, but only to himself and to his Creator, to that Supreme Judge to whom it alone appeals.

Nor is the further objection relevant that often men appeal to

their assurance of God's approval as a justification for acts of the most widely different sort. The man who buries his mother alive under a sense of filial duty, the Hindoo mother who throws her child to the crocodile, the lunatic who considers it his religious duty to kill someone, all appeal apparently to the same assurance of God's approval as Florence Nightingale, Sister Dora or John Brown.

This objection, by its very irrelevancy, may serve to emphasize the difference between the goods proposed by these two opposing systems, as tests of conduct. The Spencerian system tests conduct by objective good and evil, good and evil measured by material results; and it would unhesitatingly condemn the conduct of the savage son and the Hindoo mother as morally bad because materially bad. If it posited such a thing as a hell it would undoubtedly be logically compelled to condemn both to it for their evil conduct. Not so the Christian system, it refuses to pass judgment upon these acts as good or evil without knowledge of the spiritual state of the actors. It declares that by that spiritual state alone is every act to be judged morally good or bad. This point needs further elaboration but the proper place for it will be when we come to study the practical application of the two systems to conduct. It is merely alluded to now as an answer to the objections to the Christian theory on the score of want of objective certainty and validity.

The Spencerian system on the other hand, as we have already seen, declares agreeable sensations the test of conduct. But at the very next step in the statement of the theory we are warned of the occasional invalidity of the test: "In many cases pleasures are not connected with actions which must be performed nor pains with actions which must be avoided but contrariwise."^{*}

The reason of this is clearly set forth. It is the lack of adaptation of men to their environment that causes this disagreement of practice with theory; were it not for this lack of adaptation the truth would be recognized "that actions are completely right only when, besides being conducive to future happiness

^{*}Page 99, *Principles of Ethics*.

special and general, they are immediately pleasurable, and that painfulness not only ultimate but proximate is the concomitant of actions which are wrong."*

Comparatively slight as this qualification of the rule may at first seem, a little examination will show its significance to be very great. For observe, the argument for the truth of the rule up to this point has been: Do that which will produce immediate agreeable sensations for you; for, observing the natural phenomena around us, you will see that this is the course of nature from the simplest animal up to man himself, the oyster absorbs nourishment because of the agreeable sensation experienced in so doing, and so up to man. And apart from observation we must know *a priori* that unless every act necessary to preserve life in animals and in man had been accompanied by agreeable sensations such acts would not have been performed and both animals and man would have perished for failure to eat, drink and sleep; hence it must be assumed on this *a priori* ground as well that all necessary acts were accompanied by agreeable sensations. Latent but essential to the validity of this reasoning lies the assumption that this natural phenomenon is right, that what we observe about us of the lives and growth of animals and their various acts up to man himself are right. To assume the converse would destroy the whole ratiocinative structure; if what we see taking place about us in nature is not right in every particular then the whole argument must fall; for if it be not right for the oyster to take nourishment and perform the other acts necessary for its existence it cannot be right for man, and the argument that because these necessary acts, assumed to be right because necessary, are followed by agreeable sensations, therefore all acts are right which are followed by agreeable sensations, must fall.

But now we are told that there are acts which must be performed, that is, acts which are right, which are not followed by agreeable sensations. But these necessary acts which are right and yet are not followed by agreeable sensations are as much a part of the phenomena of nature as those necessary and right

*Page 99, *Principles of Ethics*.

acts which are followed by agreeable sensations and we have as a result that some right acts are and some are not followed by agreeable sensations, or in other words it is not true that in nature all right acts are followed by agreeable sensations. Nor does the explanation that this is due to lack of adaptation of the animal or of man to his environment help the matter. Lack of adaptation leads us still farther afield; for it assumes that there is some state or condition to which the animal or man ought to adapt himself: moreover, lack of adaptation, a condition in which the living creature and his surroundings are unsuited to each other's requirements, is as much a part of natural phenomena as adaptation of the living creature to his environment, and as such on the ground of its existence as much entitled to be called right as the other. We have no warrant for saying of one condition that is right, that is a condition suitable to the living creature, and that is wrong, a condition unsuitable to the living creature, a lack of adaptation, unless we abandon the fundamental proposition that whatever we find in nature is right and undertake to discover what the right or ideal condition is to which natural phenomena ought to conform. And to accomplish this we must know whether the living creature is wrong and ought to change, to adapt himself to his environment, or whether the environment is wrong and ought to be adapted to the living creature.

The investigation upon which we must set out really involves the ultimate purpose of nature and of all created things. Once abandon the safe harbor—that whatever we find in nature is right, and attempt to discriminate between natural phenomena and there is no stopping place in our voyage. We launch out into a sea whose only limit is the ultimate purpose of the universe. Mr. Spencer recognizes this and with a courage worthy of his great task he undertakes to trace the evolution of all from the nebulous undifferentiated matter from which our world was made through living organism to man himself. He traces the tendency of nature from the one simple undifferentiated mass of matter to the many and highly differentiated. "So it is

as we ascend from savage to civilized and from the lowest among the civilized to the highest. The rythm of external actions required to maintain the rythm of internal actions becomes at once more complicated and more complete."* * *

Thus it is assumed as a legitimate deduction from natural phenomena that the tendency or progress of living creatures from the simple to the complex, from the savage to the civilized, is progress in the right direction and, therefore, that all that helps that progress is right and that which hinders it wrong. And thus it is that he finds the means of discriminating between what is right and what is wrong in natural phenomena.

Our next inquiry, therefore, is as to the grounds of this deduction that nature's progress is from the simple to the complex, from nebulous matter to definite masses and worlds, from animals of few and simple functions to those of many and highly differentiated functions. It is plainly true that there is such a progress indicated.

Taking nature in the large we think we can trace the formation of definite worlds from indefinite nebulous matter, and taking it in a more restricted way we think we have traced the progress of animal life from the simple cell to man, and taking it still more restrictedly we trace the growth of each animal from the egg to maturity and complexity. But we must also remember that to this progression there is a perfectly corresponding retrogression from the complex to the simple. If we behold planets rising from the sea of matter we also see them sinking back to it again; dead suns and dying planets and their fragments in the shape of "falling stars" as they are popularly called, fill the dark abysses of space. Integration and disintegration go side by side.

In the majority of living creatures the process of development from simplicity to complexity is never completed. Of all living creatures only a very small percentage ever reach full maturity and perfection of function, and of man himself, the most favored of all in this respect, perhaps not one half of those born attain

*Principles cited, page 73.

the full ripeness of their powers. The majority of living creatures are hurried with ghost-like rapidity across the stage of life undeveloped into the homogeneous earth. And the few which attain the maturity and perfection of their powers and the full complexity of function retain it for but a brief space when they pass first into decrepitude and finally into utter loss of all in death. Complexity and definiteness are lost for the most favored in the homogeneity of the common mass, the earth. Over all things living is written in unmistakable characters, "Dust to dust, ashes to ashes."

So far from declaring therefore that the rightful or true progress of nature is from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous, from simplicity to complexity, a fairer statement would be that it is a perpetual swinging to and fro in a vast sea of matter, a perpetual becoming, as the Germans say, but never from it all any indication of whither its real movement tends. We behold nature progressing with perfect indifference from the complexity of the highest life to the simplicity of death and again out of death surging back to life in ceaseless tides. Unless we can discern in these the ultimate end or resting place it is as legitimate a deduction to fix upon death and the merging of the individual in the mass as life and the distinction of the individual from the mass as the true object or end of all.

It might still be argued that, conceding the ultimate end of all natural phenomena to be death, the merging of the heterogeneous and complex in the homogeneous and simple, yet that the rightful progress, the true path of nature to that ultimate end, is through the development and evolution of life from the simple to the complex. Or in other words, that we must assume that the progress of natural phenomena, no matter to what ultimate end it tends, is right *pro hac vice* just as the rise of the tide is right until it begins to fall, when its fall becomes right in turn. But this is simply a repetition in a more elaborate form of the original argument, that whatever is in nature is right. We simply take a little wider view of natural phenomena as we might of the tide, distinguishing possibly some contrary eddy in its rise as wrong and declaring its true course to be up and not

down. But then a still wider view might reveal the fact that this in turn is only an eddy in some much larger tide of nature so that we would be compelled finally either to go on to the ultimate purpose of all natural phenomena to find the real direction of its march, or we should have to fall back on the original proposition that it is all right in its turn, *pro hac vice*; because all movements, however infinitely minute, of the great onward march to the unknown end of all must be right.

To repeat the argument in a little different form, we have no proof afforded us by our study of phenomena that a civilized state is better or higher than a savage or that a more complex organism is higher than a less complex, that a man is a better animal than a particle of protoplasm, for we have no measure given us for the purpose by natural phenomena. It would be as reasonable to say that gold is better or higher than lead as to say that the complex is better or higher than the simple organism, or the civilized better or higher than the savage man. On the basis of natural phenomena all are alike. It is true we do consider gold better and higher than lead because it is more useful for accomplishing certain ends and purposes, but that is on the assumption that these ends and purposes are themselves desirable, and being so, thus render the gold desirable.

The very use of the words high and low or better and worse with reference to natural phenomena connote something apart from natural phenomena by which these characteristics may be measured.

High in what respect; better for what purpose; are the natural questions that arise upon such a statement. If the answer be high in regard to natural development or better for the purposes and ends of nature, we must know what natural development is, what the purposes and ends of nature are. The difficulty of ascertaining these has been pointed out. Even the assumption that it is a purpose or end of nature to foster life or to produce agreeable sensations for living creatures, finds little support in natural phenomena. Nature is supremely selfish and self-seeking, the preying of animals and even of plants upon each other, the fierce egoistic struggle for existence, may be

found illustrated in every act of nature's drama. The very life of many animals depends on the destruction of others. All nature is a contention, fierce, continuous, unrelenting, merciless. The principle of the greatest happiness of all or even of any one creature is found nowhere. Many animals destroy their own offspring; and of some fish ova, so little is life regarded, about .00001 per cent. only are developed into living creatures and even of these not all reach maturity.

We have tried to study the system on its abstract side, let us now take it up on its practical side as promulgating a rule of conduct and it will be seen that it leads its followers by a different path to the same unsatisfactory quagmire of doubt and uncertainty.

Do that which will yield the greatest amount of agreeable sensations to you immediately, is a plain and easy rule which is largely practiced by man without any thought of the profound philosophic sanction given it by Mr. Spencer. It is not hard to follow, it causes little hesitation or doubt to the simplest. The second or modified injunction, Do that which will ultimately yield the greatest amount of agreeable sensations, might well puzzle the subtlest thinker. Nothing short of Omnipotence could guide the ethical disciple to an answer to such a problem; it is insoluble by human wit or human knowledge. It opens up vistas of eternity to mortal inquiry.

Nor does the practical corollary which is added give us any real aid: "Accumulated experiences have produced the consciousness that guidance by feelings which refer to remote and general results is usually more conducive to welfare than guidance by feelings to be immediately gratified."*

If we are to govern our conduct not by immediate but by "remote and general" agreeable sensations the question naturally arises, how far are we required to look forward to the "remote and general" agreeable sensations. Is our prospect to be confined within any limit of time or are we at liberty or required to look as far as possible even into the next world for the "remote and general" agreeable sensations which are to be our guide.

*Page 126, Principles already cited.

The "accumulated experiences" referred to cover a very small space of time compared to the life of the entire race and as they tell us nothing of the next world our knowledge from them is perforce confined to this. Conduct which might be conducive to "remote and general" agreeable sensations in this world might have just the contrary effect in the next. In truth there is a volume of high antiquity which more than hints at something of this sort, remarking in one place: "Thou in thy life time receivest thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things, but now he is comforted and thou art tormented."*

Such a possibility is sufficient to shake the scientific accuracy of the rule. But, even confining the operation of the rule to this world and its "experiences" the testimony of phenomena in its favor is by no means clear. Everything else being equal it is plain that a present good ought to have greater authority as a guide than that which is remote and contingent. Phenomena, so far as we know them as a guide, declare the present good superior and to be preferred, because present and sure, to the future, because future and contingent. How generally this doctrine is accepted by men in ordinary practice needs no exposition. And it is hard to see on any scientifically deduced principle any error in their logic; or how, on the basis expressly accepted by the system, future agreeable sensations can be shown to deserve as a guide the superiority declared, for even accepting the further principle that the conduct which produces the greatest amount of agreeable sensations in the long run is right, the popular belief expressed in the adage "a short life and a merry one" is not easily proved unsound. The man who indulges every appetite and gathers all the present—agreeable sensations—he possibly can, without regard to future agreeable sensations, and who exhausts them all and dies in consequence in his early youth may be argued with great show of probability to have enjoyed many more agreeable sensations than the so-called right living man who lives to three-score. First, his pleasures have been intense, while the right living man's have been largely, we must suppose, altruistic, and therefore much fainter, as all repre-

**Gospel of St. Luke, Chap. 16, v. 25.*

sentative pleasures must be; the first man has passed from life before the decrepitude and misery of age has reached him and thus has escaped that debtor balance of suffering which nature exacts from all in greater or less degree in old age, he has made sure in a few years of agreeable sensations which the other has had to wait years for with all the uncertainty and possibility of loss that the waiting implies.

Stating the case as favorably as possible it must be admitted that the uncertainty as to the result reduces the scientific accuracy of the rule to a mere probability that possibly the corollary may be true. And the men who accepted the teaching that the conduct was right which produced ultimately the greatest amount of agreeable sensations might, without plainly transgressing it, ignore the corollary and proceed to gather as fast as possible, as large a crop as he could of present agreeable sensations.

So much for the theoretical truth of the Spencerian system. We now come to the certainty of the two as practical guides of conduct. Much of this has necessarily and unavoidably been discussed in treating of the theoretical truth of the two.

The chief difficulty of the Spencerian system in its application to conduct lies in its measurement of right and wrong conduct, not by the spiritual state or consciousness of the doer of an act but by the material results of the act. How strongly this difficulty pressed the distinguished author is apparent by his invention of the term "Ethics of Enmity" * and his remarks upon the committing of theft and arson, "injunctions which the religion of Enmity countenances—by the religion of Amity—condemned as crimes. Hate and destroy your fellow man is now the command and then the command is, love and aid your fellow man." †

It confesses its inadequacy and acknowledges that its rules fail altogether when applied to the conflicts of man with man or nation with nation in war. And even in peace and under normal conditions such as we find every day confronting us it admits that under its system absolute right and wrong are impos-

*Page 317, et passim.

†Page 135, Principles already cited.

sible to be known. "Instead of admitting that there is in every case a right and a wrong it may be contended that in multitudinous cases no right properly so called can be alleged but only a least wrong."*

Here lies the fundamental error of the system, namely, the making material well-being, *i. e.*, agreeable sensations, the only good known to man's consciousness, to the neglect of that spiritual well-being—the consciousness of God's approval. The failure to note this distinction is at the root of all the uncertainty which the Spencerian system exhibits in its practical application to conduct:

And yet the distinction between material and spiritual good is one drawn every day by the least philosophic. It is the recognized foundation of all those judgments in which men, while disapproving of outward acts as materially injurious and evil, pronounce the actors free from moral blame. In every war between Christian nations we know that good men fight and pray and die on both sides doing things diametrically opposite in their material consequences, yet popular opinion does not condemn as wrong the conduct of either although holding the most diverse opinions upon the material results of their respective conduct.

Some of the favorite cruces of the moral philosophers are based on the neglect of this same distinction. The question whether the duty of telling the truth would compel one to tell a would-be murderer or robber the road taken by his intended victim is a crux of this sort. The answer is simple: whatever course of conduct approves itself to your own consciousness of right so that you have that feeling of assurance of righteousness within you is right for you to pursue and one man might lie and another might tell the truth and the conduct of each would be spiritually right, however different the material result. In the same way it is conceivable that the theft and arson—which the Spencerian system confesses itself unable to practically deal with, save by inventing an independent system of ethics therefor—may be right conduct spiritually considered just as it was right

*Page 260.

for Abraham to make ready to commit the murder of his son Isaac, or for the disciples to commit the theft, as Prof. Huxley alleges, of the ass and the colt at the command of God. To the Christian system these cases present no difficulties, but to the Spencerian they are insoluble as already shown. In many cases the latter admits it has no positive answer, no sure guidance to give in the difficulties of life, except a guess, by its own confession, inadequate and uncertain. The Christian system is positive and peremptory; in no case however difficult does it give an uncertain reply to those who ask its guidance; it declares, do that which satisfies your own consciousness of right, regardless of all material consequences. This does not mean that material consequences are not to be considered, nor that there may not be many a struggle to decide what specific thing ought to be done, nor that the actor is to trust to impulse or feeling for guidance, but it means that the actor, having done his best to see what was right in the light of all the knowledge, spiritual and material, which he can bring to bear, and having honestly come to the belief that he ought to commit a certain act, that for him such act is right, without a shadow of doubt, and the material consequences, whether beneficial or otherwise, are in this spiritual aspect, of no importance. In this connection some further explanation may be proper regarding the true relation of spiritual to material good. That there is a relation between the two must be evident but like all those points where matter and spirit come into touch one with the other, the explanation is not easily made. Unconsciously we confuse the two and transfer the qualities of one to the other, and this is made especially easy by the fact that often, we might say generally, the two goods, spiritual and material coincide in their outward expression in conduct. The acts that confer material good, life, health, food, peace, content, are usually good in both senses, just as the acts that destroy material good, that injure health and life and property, are bad spiritually as well as materially. It is so easy to thus measure conduct by outward results, and the judgments thus arrived at are usually so correct that it is natural to feel surprise and some doubt when we find these exceptional cases

(some of which have been cited above) where the two do not coincide. What intensifies this feeling is the further discovery of the physical necessity of repressing by law many which lay claim to spiritual goodness as their warrant for existing. For example we forbid the throwing of children to crocodiles, the burying of mothers alive, in some countries the marrying of more than one wife, without regard to the spiritual good claimed by the actors for these acts. In so doing no judgment is passed on the subjective spiritual quality of the acts, but simply a physical conclusion is reached that for the existence and good of society such acts cannot be suffered, and the law is in its relation to spiritual good as impersonal as the attraction of gravitation.

In other words, spiritual good and evil are matters not within the knowledge of men except individually, each for himself, and not one for the other, so that judgment as to spiritual matters is impossible except for the guidance of individual conduct. It is this attempt to improperly apply to spiritual matters the kind of judgments which we are accustomed to pass in material physical matters that leads to the difficulty with which so many ethical systems struggle.

In all the history of the world there was never greater need than now for emphasizing this distinction between spiritual good and material good. This is the day of material well-being and physical comfort. Its conveniences and luxuries press upon us all with an abundance that is overwhelming. Nature is giving up to man's enjoyments secrets that had been buried since the creation.

No wonder that the belief should spread of the salvation of the world by physical means; that even the churches should say: Make a man physically comfortable and you will make him morally good. Feed the hungry and clothe the naked before you preach to them.

The Spencerian Ethics is the legitimate child of such an environment, and its method of treating conduct and law on the side of materialism is wonderfully enlightening and helpful, but

when it comes to reduce all goodness that man is capable of to a good dinner and a warm fire, for that is after all its final meaning, the epithet of Pig philosophy is not undeserved.

ARTICLE II.

THE CLASSICS ONCE MORE.

BY PROF. EDWIN W. BOWEN, PH. D.

Many attacks have been made of late upon the educative value of the classics. It seems to have become fashionable in some quarters to decry them and to make an effort, more or less successful, to dislodge them from the time-honored position they have held now for many centuries in the curricula of the schools and colleges. So pronounced in some places is this disparagement that it must give us pause.

It may not, therefore, be amiss for us to consider briefly, without attempting any exhaustive discussion of the subject, a few of the reasons that are urged by those modern educators who thus berate the classics. The more liberal of this class of educators advise that Latin and Greek be reduced to a very subordinate place in the curriculum, while the more radical, however, insist upon the elimination of these languages both from the high school and college curriculum and advise that French and German be substituted for them. Your extreme utilitarian who values most that education that insures the speediest fortune would go a step farther and exclude even French and German, substituting therefor, "a practical course." Fortunately for the cause of education these extremists are in the minority and their proposals carry little weight.

Numerous strictures have been made upon the educational methods of our country and the wisdom of our fathers challenged, and ourselves called antiquated, and chided for not keeping in touch with the demands of the times. And all this censure simply because we still cling to Latin and Greek and insist upon the retention of Latin, at least, in the college curriculum. I should like to say at the outset that in this discussion I do not

intend my remarks to apply to the professional and technical schools, but only to the college, which, since it offers a course in the liberal arts leading up to the Bachelor's degree, is, therefore, supposed to give a liberal education. This premised, let us proceed.

The chief point of attack upon our college curriculum is, as said above, the classics. It is claimed that it is useless to make a child study Latin and Greek for the reason that these are dead languages and will never be of any service to him when he becomes a man and has to go out into the world to make a living. Far better abolish these useless subjects, it is claimed, and substitute for them some of the sciences, which are practical and useful. Let us see if this reason that is urged against the classics is a valid argument, or whether it is specious. If this is a valid reason, we owe it to the youth of our land to cease to waste their valuable time in a useless study and to devise for them a system of education that will educate in the highest, broadest and noblest sense. We owe it, also, as a duty to ourselves as educators not to misguide the pupils entrusted to our tuition, nor allow them to burden their memories with mental rubbish, which possesses neither intrinsic nor disciplinary value, as is claimed to be true of the classics. The sarcastic reply Themistocles is reputed to have given the enthusiast who was descanting to him upon the advantages of a new art of memory must find a sympathetic endorsement by every youth of the present day, whose memory is burdened with the multitudinous forms of Greek and Latin, as the disparagers of classical education tell us. "Teach me rather to forget," said Themistocles. We appreciate the humor of the situation. But we maintain that a knowledge of Latin and Greek is not a useless knowledge that simply burdens the memory and is inflicted upon the submissive pupil, out of sheer perversity on the part of the teachers, to annoy him and make his young life miserable. On the contrary, the study of the classics is valuable, not only because of their disciplinary and cultural fitness, but also because of the light and help they afford us in the command and use of our vernacular language.

Every English-speaking man who has enjoyed the advantages of a classical education surely must feel that his study of Latin and Greek has been of incalculable benefit to him in acquiring a command and knowledge of his own speech. This can not be otherwise, since the vernacular contains so large an element of Latin and Greek words and has been so materially influenced by Latin in its growth and development. During the Anglo-Saxon period of our language, the formative period, so to say, Latin began to exert a marked influence upon English, as may be seen from a careful comparative study of the Latin translations of that day into the vernacular. Nowhere is this influence more notable in points of syntax than in the construction of the so-called nominative absolute, by some grammarians termed the objective absolute. (In Alfred's time the dative was the absolute case and remained so down to the modern English period, when the transition to the nominative occurred, Milton representing the transitional stage.) This locution has been shown conclusively to have been introduced into our tongue from the Latin through the translation of the ablative absolute construction.

The influence of Latin upon English in point of vocabulary is so obvious to every one who has looked into the matter, even in the most cursory manner, that attention need not be drawn to this phase of the subject. So great is this influence that no man who does not command a first-rate knowledge of Latin is capable of finding his way confidently through the labyrinthine maze of English orthography. But to him who possesses a fair acquaintance with Latin, how much clearer and more luminous does the intricate subject appear! So in regard to the meaning of many English words derived from the Latin language. Take the case of two lawyers, one of whom is acquainted with that tongue, the other not. How much more real, familiar and lucid does the legal terminology appear to the one who has a knowledge of Latin than to the other who has no acquaintance with that speech! Or if we take the profession of medicine, do we not find the same distinction to hold good? Yes, you say, but these are the learned professions. To be sure, I reply, and you

observe the advantage of a classical education here. Shall we not then suppose that the same is true of all professions into which skill and knowledge enter?

In the matter of style the advantage of a classical education is no less important and decided. Not that every man who writes forcefully and expresses himself tersely and accurately must first have spent his nights and days with the classic Latin or Greek authors, though in nine cases out of ten, every man who does so is familiar with the classics; nor, on the other hand, that every classical scholar is necessarily a good writer. But it is a significant fact that cannot be gainsaid that most of our stylists, with just few enough exceptions to prove the rule, have been those who were steeped in Greek or Latin literature or in both. Cardinal Newman, Matthew Arnold and John Ruskin—authors standing in the very front ranks of Victorian literature, stylists who are held up as models for our admiration and emulation—these were all three zealous classicists. I venture the statement that much of the wrong grammar and shocking choice of words which President Andrews, in his suggestive article on modern college education, in the September *Cosmopolitan*, complains of as being not the worst faults of many of our young doctors of philosophy and specialists, would be much improved if those same men had first taken a thorough classical course before entering upon their special work.

I am no *laudator temporis acti*, nor yet am I so blind an admirer of the present age as not to criticise whatever in it is inferior to the past, whatever is censurable. But I firmly believe that much of our mental confusion of the present day would be cleared up if, in our dubious eagerness for the new in the way of educational methods, as in everything else, we had not ruthlessly cut away from our old, established methods, the effectiveness of which has been proved for many centuries. The effective educational methods which have produced trained and sturdy minds in every profession, from the establishment of our civilization down to the present time, have not, because of a few changed conditions of life, suddenly become antiquated and effete.

The revolt from the classics in certain quarters proves the

existence of discontent with our present educational methods and of a desire to yield to the pressure of the times. The result has been the substitution of a multiplicity of subjects in the place of Latin and Greek, or their reduction to such a minimum that they have almost been crowded out of the curriculum. In some instances the sciences have been suggested as a suitable substitute, in others French and German. Let us notice for a moment these two classes of substitutions. And first the sciences.

No right-thinking man can object to the study of the sciences or to their inclusion in the curriculum. We should be as comprehensive and catholic in matters of education as in matters of taste, like the old farmer in the *Self-Tormentor*, who gave utterance to the immortal sentiment, *Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto*. It is but right and proper then that every one should be taught the sciences—biology, chemistry and physics. These are all legitimate subjects of study and should find a place in every college curriculum. But let us not in our very effort to be catholic and liberal become exclusive and narrow, and thus eliminate the classics to include the sciences. The study of the former will qualify us for the eager pursuit of the latter. Most of the sciences would prove less difficult for the pupil if his mind were first trained by the classical studies. I do not think that the pupil is prepared really to profit by the instruction of the scientific teacher till the powers of his youthful mind are fairly well developed. Now what means shall we use to bring about this desired development so as to enable the pupil at an early age to begin with profit the study of biology, chemistry and physics? The answer is the classics. Dr. Arnold of Rugby, than whom England has probably never produced a greater and more inspiring teacher, used to say: "The study of language seems to me as if it was given for the very purpose of forming the human mind in youth; and the Latin and Greek languages, in themselves so perfect, and at the same time freed from the inseparable difficulty which must attend any attempt to teach boys philology through the medium of their own spoken language, seem the very instruments by which this is to be effected."

And his biographer significantly adds that the conviction grew upon him that, after all, "it was not knowledge, but the means of gaining knowledge which he had to teach." In a word, the development of the mental powers is the object sought after in education, and no study offers a more effectual means to this end for the young mind than does the study of the classics.

The object of all the studies which we set the youth is to educate him, to develop his mental powers so that he may be qualified to grapple with any subject whatever it may be, that he may be fitted to solve the problems in life that present themselves for solution, no matter how difficult they may be. If this is true, then we should have in the curriculum *par excellence*, those studies which best develop the natural faculties of the mind, those subjects which lend themselves most readily to this end; and that the classics are the studies best adapted for this purpose, experience and time-honored practice have demonstrated conclusively. It follows, also, that the youth should be required to study not only what he likes, but even what he does not like. For life is varied and checked, made up of pleasant and unpleasant things. It frequently confronts us with distasteful and difficult situations, which we would fain evade if we could, but alas! we can not. We must meet them and solve them as best we can. Therefore, the mental training that does not teach us to surmount obstacles is radically defective. It is the part of education to teach us how to adjust ourselves to changed conditions or whatever character. This in rebuttal to the argument that a boy should be allowed some choice of study, and that if he does not elect to study the classics, he ought not to be required to waste his time upon a useless subject in which he takes no interest.

Let us, however, consider the second proposed substitution for the classics, viz., French and German. I am not one to discourage the study of those languages. To do so would be to argue myself grossly and lamentably ignorant of modern French and German scholarship. Germany is the country, above all others I should say, to which American scholarship, however supine, is profoundly indebted at once for its inspiration and for

its actual scholarly achievements. No advanced student, in whatever department of learning, can afford then to remain unacquainted with German, or with French either, for that matter. Indeed, a fair knowledge of these tongues is absolutely essential as one of the first qualifications for work, as well in the humanities as in the sciences. But while this is all true, it yet seems a glaring mistake, which ought not to be permitted to pass uncriticised, to regard these modern languages as equal to the classics in point of educational value, and, therefore, be allowed without protest to supplant them in the college curriculum. We ought not to acquiesce supinely in any such attempted change.

In the first place, French and German, being by no means so highly inflected languages as Latin and Greek, do not, for that very reason, train and develop the pupil's memory, his analytical faculty his reasoning powers, and, in a word, his mind so readily and so thoroughly as the classics do. Again, as we have seen, a knowledge of the classics is very helpful to a clear comprehension and a wide command of our own tongue, and is absolutely necessary to its complete mastery. But a man may speak German and French with marked accuracy and fluency, and yet his linguistic knowledge does not necessarily imply a good command of English, nor indeed does it insure a correct use of it, either with tongue or pen. This is merely another way of saying that French and German have not influenced English so much as Latin and Greek have. Though German is a cognate language with the English, and French furnished us in the Middle-English period with large additions to our vocabulary, yet because these are living and consequently changing languages, whereas the classics are dead and stereotyped, these facts serve to explain why a knowledge of the latter is more helpful to us in the command and use of our tongue than knowledge of the former. Furthermore, if we first acquire a knowledge of Latin, the work of studying French or any other descendant of the mother tongue, becomes far less arduous. French is, therefore, a comparatively easy language to learn if we are already conversant with Latin.

I said that a man might speak French and German fluently

and accurately. But this should be modified. I am transcending my prescribed limits in the discussion. I proposed to confine my remarks to the college curriculum and its work. Now, as a matter of fact, our college students are not linguists. Very few of them are bilingual, fewer still trilingual. They hardly ever learn so to master either French or German, while at college, as to be able to speak the language. They learn these languages grammatically as a dead language, so that, after all, French and German, as practically studied at college, are reduced to the same level as Latin and Greek. Hence the argument in favor of the substitution of French and German for the classics from the point of view of utility, falls to the ground. Now if this is true, and experience and observation show that it is, what advantage is to be gained by the proposed substitution? Clearly none, since we do not study the languages as living tongues and consequently cannot speak them. But some one who has not experimental knowledge of the practice in our colleges may demur to this conclusion. Then I will give my own experience as a student, which is presumably that of the average collegian, at least in the South. I myself graduated in French and German at my college and, when I entered the Johns Hopkins University, passed the preliminary examination in reading in those languages and presented German as a subordinate subject when a candidate for the Doctor's degree. Yet I could not speak German, though I knew it historically in the various stages of its development, but only as a dead language. That is to say, in my study of German I had trained only my eye, not my ear, despite the exhortations of my professor to do both. The result was that when, after taking my degree, I went to Germany to pursue further my studies at the University of Leipzig, I was at first unable to express myself with any appreciable degree of ease to myself or even to my auditors. But after some practice I acquired some command over my rebellious organs of speech, and my tongue learned to utter what I intended to say. I might say incidentally that during those struggling days of mine I took something of a fiendish delight in the fruitless though heroic

efforts of certain of my German confreres to converse in English. The cause of my temporary embarrassment was that in my study of German I had trained my eye, but at the expense both of my ear and my tongue. So with those German students who had studied English. Such then are my experience and my observation, and I believe it is the common experience and observation of most of the professors and students in our colleges.

It is clear then that the argument in support of the substitution of French and German for the classics is not valid. The substitution can not be defended either on the ground of mental training or of utility.

It is not, however, claimed for the classics that they furnish the ideal or the sole mental discipline that the mind needs for its full development. French and German and other studies, including the sciences and philosophy, are also essential for a complete, well-rounded education. But the classics are doubtless entitled to a prominent place both for the intrinsic cultural value of their subject matter as well as for their disciplinary value. There are many teachers who do not share the views of one of our distinguished educators, recently expressed, in his strictures upon the worthlessness of classic mythology, the indecency of Virgil and so forth. There are likewise many who would not heartily subscribe to his views, subsequently expressed at a state teachers' meeting, that the state should provide food for the pupils of the public schools. Not that the supply of wholesome food at the public expense might not in itself be a good thing for the children that are to be educated. This is perhaps true. But there is the possibility of abuse of paternal government, and if bread is provided gratis, the parents may also demand public entertainment, the circus, to gratify the eye of the child; and then, if we, like the ancient Romans, had *panem et circenses*, what kind of citizens might we logically expect the children to become? The aim of education might be defeated.

There is some danger perhaps of cheapening education too much and of degrading it by reducing it to a mercenary basis. This were to vulgarize it. There seems already, in some quarters to be a tendency in this direction. Some of our colleges,

in their zeal to allow as much latitude as possible in the choice of subjects, have included in their curricula a great variety of subjects of study and in practice permit almost any kind of substitution. This of course is in the nature of a reaction from the old cast-iron curriculum. Some of our colleges, eager for numbers and yielding to a vulgar demand, have added a business course, while others, overstepping the legitimate bounds of a college, have added a law course or a preliminary medical course. This invasion by the college of the province of the professional or the technical school has led to such confusion that a college education no longer implies a distinct and definite classical training, but may mean almost anything or nothing. Professor Peck scarcely put the case too strongly when he said in his very thoughtful paper on education, in the July *Cosmopolitan*: "When we hear to-day that so-and-so is a university man, one never knows by reason of that fact alone whether this person is in reality a gentleman and a scholar, or whether he is only a sublimated type of tinker."

Abuse of the Bachelor's degree, therefore, has resulted as a concomitant of the bad practice on the part of some colleges combining professional training with general education. This degree no longer presupposes, necessarily, the general training and culture it once did. We ought to have a distinct line of demarcation separating the college proper from the professional school, and the existing hybrid college ought to be forced by public sentiment to take a decided stand, and ceasing to temporize, to become, once for all, either a professional school or a college. At present the hybrid college proves an incubus upon the cause of higher education and tends to lower the tone of the college and the professional school alike.

"It is in view of this gradual and yet rapid change," says Professor Mahaffy, in his address on modern education recently delivered, "that I am disposed to abandon the principles which I held in former years and declare myself the advocate of another theory. We used to believe that it was not only possible, but far better, to combine general education with special training—to insist that the professional student should qualify in

arts, and the artisan in general subjects. Early in this century such a combination was certainly a good thing ; but now this effort of combining arts' degrees with special training seems to me to lead to the deterioration of both. There is growing up at our universities a large body of professional students who are coaxed to remain arts' students by all sorts of indulgences and remissions, so that what remains is no real general education, while at the same time their special training is hampered. What we want is a system of great technical colleges, as well as technical schools where we shall honestly undertake to teach boys their special business, and not pretend to give them an education in arts, or puff them up with sham titles of B. A. or M. A."

In conclusion, it may be noted, as has been intimated, that the multiplication of subjects in the college curriculum tends to foster superficiality, which is the bane of scholarship. The danger that threatens our education now is sciolism, which must be guarded against most strenuously. We cannot afford to teach our students to be superficial and thus defeat the very object of a college education and seriously impair the progress of higher education among us. "The first function, then,"—I quote from Professor Mahaffy's speech again—"is to afford a complete and thorough training, especially in those great subjects called useless by the vulgar, but which are the real salt of any higher education." Intension, not extension, should be the motto in education. This is the spirit that inspires and accomplishes all research work, all work the aim of which is the enlargement of the boundaries of human knowledge. This is the spirit, too, that should inspire us in the preparation and equipment of the minds of those committed to us for the successful accomplishment of so grand and noble a work.

Randolph-Macon College, Va.

ARTICLE III.

LUTHER AND THE AUGSBURG CONFESsION.

[CONTINUED FROM VOL. XXIX. P. 527.]

BY PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D.

THE CONFESsION IS NOT YET FINISHED.

Of the *exact* form of the Confes sion at this particular time, May 22nd, we have no information. We know this, however: The Confes sion is by no means finished, and both the civil counsellors and the theologians are steadily at work on it, for, May 28th, the Nurenberg legates write to their senate that "the Elector's counsellors and learned men are holding daily sessions over their Confes sion, and are changing and improving it, for the purpose of giving it such a form that it cannot be passed over, but must be heard."*

Three days later, May 31st, these same legates write: "The Saxon Confes sion is not yet finished. But the same articles as they have been composed in Latin, have been delivered to us. These, without the Preface and Conclusion, about which there is yet the greatest uncertainty, have been transcribed by Jerome Ebner's sons, and will be sent to you. The German, on which they are daily making improvements, we will obtain when it is finished, and we will send it to you."†

June 3d these legates write as follows: "We send you herewith a copy of the Saxon Confes sion in Latin. It has the Preface, but lacks an article or two at the end, and the Conclusion. On these the Saxon theologians are still engaged. So soon as it is finished it will be sent to you. Meanwhile have your learned men examine and consider it. So soon as the Confes sion is put into German it shall be laid before you."‡

It is evident from these letters that work on the Confes sion is

*C. R. II, 71.

†C. R. II, 78.

‡C. R. II, 83.

proceeding very slowly. There is yet lacking Article XX., Of Faith and Good Works, and perhaps Article XXI., Of the Worship of Saints, and the Conclusion,—in quantity about one third of the entire doctrinal part, and in importance a part second only to Article IV.

June 8th these legates write again: “The Saxon Confession of faith recently sent you was intended by us to be laid before your preachers and other counsellors for examination. Gladly would we have sent you the Appendix and Conclusion, but the Saxon theologians are not yet ready with these, [that is, Article XX, perhaps Article XXI., and the Epilogue, had not yet been composed.] We will persevere. According to the tenor of the instructions given us, you mean that in your affairs we should unite with the Elector and Margrave George, and that they and you should unite in this matter. But inasmuch as the Saxon Confession is to be presented in the form of a petition in the name of the Elector alone, it is our opinion that it will be necessary to consider whether you, in connection with the Saxon Confession, shall compose a Confession in your own name to be delivered to the Emperor, or whether together with Margrave George, you shall urge the Elector to prepare a Confession not alone in his own name, but in common, in his name, in that of Margrave George, and in yours, and in that of the Estates and cities which are taking part in this transaction. We await your instruction in this matter; and as regards speaking with Margrave George, I, Kress, have already spoken with the Margrave's chancellor on the subject. He says that his Master's preachers and learned men are also considering the subject, and that his Master perceives the same deficiency that we do, viz: that the Saxon Confession has been composed solely in the name of the Elector, and that he (the Margrave) regards it as advantageous to present it (the Confession) in common in the name of all the Princes and Estates who agree in the articles of faith, and adhere to his Grace and to the Elector.”*

This letter shows that up to June 8th the Saxon Confession is still far from being completed; that it is still the *Saxon Con-*

*C. R. II., 88.

fection, and not the common confession of the evangelical Estates; that the Elector had not yet been asked to prepare a common confession; that concert of action had not even been agreed upon by the other evangelical Estates; that it is still a question whether the Nurenbergers shall not present a Confession of their own.

A COMMON CONFESSION PROPOSED.

But this letter of June 8th reveals the beginning of a movement to have all the Evangelicals unite in the preparation and presentation of a common confession. This thought seems to have been entertained at the very same time, but independently of each other, by the Nurenbergers and the officials of Margrave George. We wonder that the thought of united action, and of a common confession, had not manifested itself sooner. But there were difficulties in the way. Philip of Hesse showed strong sympathy with the doctrinal views of the Strassburgers and the Zwinglians.* Some of the evangelical princes and cities had brought, or sent, articles to Augsburg, and might not be immediately willing to abandon these; the Saxons were going on with the preparation of their own Confession, apparently without much concern about the other Evangelicals; the Elector was at the head of the Evangelical party, and it might look like

*For political, as well as for theological, reasons the Lutherans assembled at Augsburg were intensely hostile to the views of the Zwinglians. Agricola preached again and again at Augsburg against the Zwinglian view of the Lord's Supper, and called the Zwinglians *Geschriststuermer*. Michael Heller defended the Zwinglian view. (See Jonas's *Briefwechsel I.*, 151-2, also, *Politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation*, pp. 444, *et seqq., passim*). Melanchthon and Brentz labored hard to turn the Landgrave from his Zwinglian views. (See their letters to him and his reply in C. R. II., 92-103.) Melanchthon even invoked the aid of Luther, C. R. II., 39, 59. But Luther did not write the Landgrave until June 20th, hence too late to influence him in his relation to the Augsburg Confession, for Knaake has shown (*Luther's Antheil*, p. 47) that this, and not May 20th (*De Wette IV.*, 23), is the date of Luther's letter to the Landgrave. (See also Köstlin, *Martin Luther*, II., 216, 654, and Schirrmacher, *Briefe und Acten*, p. 489.) Dr. Krauth (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 227) has made a singular mistake in applying the passage in Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd: "There is need of your letters," to

*George, Duke of Saxony," instead of to the Landgrave.

impertinence for the others to suggest a common confession to their superior. Moreover, at least in the earlier stage of the proceedings, the Elector did not favor coöperative effort, and had actually rebuked the suggestion.* Happily the obstacles that at first stood in the way of united action were removed by the consciousness of a common faith, and the sense of a common danger, so that at length perfect unity of confession was attained.

But it is due chiefly to the Nurenbergers that the Evangelicals assembled at Augsburg united in the presentation of a common confession. June 15th they write to their Senate as follows: "The Saxon Confession of Faith is finished in German. We send it to you. It does not yet have the Preface and the Conclusion. Philip Melanchthon has announced that he has not prepared these in German, as he thinks that the Preface and Conclusion may probably not be prepared in the name of the Elector alone, but in common in the name of all the united Lutheran Princes and Estates. In the German Articles, as you will see, he has already made a change. Where in the Latin it is stated that in Electoral Saxony, this or that is preached, or held, in the German he has omitted Electoral Saxony and has substituted a common word which refers to all the Estates. You will lay this plan before you preachers and counsellors, and report to us your conclusion. Also, inasmuch as the Preface and Conclusion are still held in abeyance, and as nothing has been said to the Margrave and to us, we think it would be well for us to speak with Margrave George, and then in his name and in yours, to make a suggestion to the Elector. We offer this for your further consideration, and await your decision, especially as to whether we shall present a Preface and Conclusion according to your conception, or shall request a confession in common words in the name of all the Princes and Estates, and shall send the same to you for further revision.

*To the request of the Nurenbergers for a copy of the "Apology," Chancellor Brück, after having spoken with the Elector on the subject, made answer as follows: "His Electoral Grace doesn't like many counsellors in this matter, for the devil, such were his words, would have the last word (wäre nachträglich) C. R. II., 53.

"The Article, Of Faith and Works, at the end, is finished in the German Confession, but not in the Latin, which we formerly sent you. We have requested this. Since the Article has not yet been composed in Latin, we could not yet send it (the Confession) to you in Latin. But we shall see that it shall be ready in about two days."*

From this letter we learn that on Wednesday, June 15th, the Saxon Confession still lacked the Preface and the Conclusion in both languages; that Article XX., Of Faith and Good Works, had not yet been composed in Latin; that the Confession was still called the *Saxon* Confession; that no suggestion had yet been made to the Elector about a Common Confession; and hence that it had not yet been agreed by the Princes and Estates to have a common confession; that the thought of unity of action in a common confession is confined to the Nurenbergers and to Margrave George, and that no conference of all the Evangelicals has yet been held to revise, to consider, to decide upon, and to adopt the Saxon Confession as the Common Confession. These things are all made plain to us by this official letter of the Nurenberg legates.

JUNE 15TH—19TH.

Such is the condition in which the Evangelical Princes and Estates find themselves in relation to the Saxon Confession and to each other, June 15th, the day on which the Emperor entered Augsburg. That the Princes and Estates were occupied during this entire day from five o'clock in the morning to eleven o'clock at night in quarreling with each other, in preparing to receive, in receiving and escorting the Emperor into the city, and the Evangelicals in awaiting his pleasure at court, is simply demonstrable.† That during the three following days they were en-

*C. R. II., 105.

†For the specific facts, see Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 263; Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, pp. 54, 57, 59; Spalatin's *Annales*, p. 132; C. R. II., 106; Cyprian's *Historia, Beylagen*, VI., p. 66. It is evident that the Nurenberg legates wrote their letter of June 15th late in the day, for they say that the imperial commissioners strove long at the Rathaus to settle the strife between the princes. C. R. II., 106.

tirely occupied with the *Corpus Christi* Festival, in resisting the Emperor's demand for the suppression of preaching, and in preparing *Bedenken*, is likewise demonstrable.* That any work was done on the Confession during the four days, June 15th—18th, there is not one iota of evidence. It is indeed demonstrable that the Evangelical Princes, Estates, counsellors, and theologians, were so fully and so strenuously occupied with other things during those four days that no time could possibly have remained to them for work on the Confession. In addition to these facts we know positively that work on the Confession was suspended, and that it was in danger of being abandoned.† Hence very properly does Engelhardt say: "Article XXI. was added after June 16th."‡ But on which day after that date it was added we have no *certain* means of knowing. We are now brought to Saturday evening, June 18th, when at seven o'clock the imperial proclamation forbidding preaching, is heralded through the streets of Augsburg.§ Sunday, June 19th, is measurably a day of rest. John Brentz writes a very long letter to his friend Isenmann, but does not allude to the Confession.

*For the particulars see C. R. II., 111; Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, p. 64 *et seqq.*, 482 *et seqq.*; Förstemann's *Urkundenbuch*, I., 268, 283, 290; Müller's *Historie*, p. 545; C. R. II., 117, 118. Melanchthon, writing of the demand for the suppression of preaching, says: "This matter was in dispute three entire days." C. R. II., 117, 118.

†See Schmidt's *Philip Melanchthon*, pp. 195-6; C. R. II., 112, 117, 118; XXVI., 209; Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 93; Maurenbrecker's *Geschichte der Katholischen Reformation*, 287, 409, 410; Kolde in *Real-Encyclopaedie*, II., 246. The original contemporaneous documents belonging to, and reporting, the actions and transactions of June 15th-18th, are so numerous, full and circumstantial as to enable us to say where the Evangelical Princes, their counsellors, and theologians were, and what they were doing, almost every hour of those four days; and yet in those documents the Confession is not once named; though Jonas writing to Luther on the 18th, after seven o'clock, P. M., says: *Nos Deo dante in causa principali proxima 3d fa artculos offeremus. Briefwechsel*, I., 160. Compare Schirrmacher, pp. 70, 71.

‡*Die innere Genesis und Zusammenhang der Marburger, Schwabacher und Torgauer Artikel, sowie der Augsburger Confession*, Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865), p. 600. This paper, which extends from p. 515 to 629, is a classic on the subject of which it treats.

§Schirrmacher, p. 70; Spalatin's *Annales*, p. 133; C. R. II., 124; Jonas's *Briefwechsel*, I., p. 159.

Melanchthon writes a letter to each of his friends, Myconius, Luther, Menius and Camerarius. In three of these letters he does not even allude to the Confession. In the letter to Camerarius he says: "I did not doubt that our Apology would seem milder than the improbity of our adversaries deserves. Nevertheless I embraced those things which are principal in the case." It is very significant that he employs past tenses. The Nuremberg legates also write a letter on this day, June 19th, to their senate. In the afternoon of this day the Princes are summoned before the Emperor, listen to some instructions in regard to rank, have their differences *inter se* settled, and are ordered to meet the Emperor the next morning at seven o'clock to open the Diet. This consumed the entire afternoon, as we learn from the account given by Coelestin—*die in vesperam vergente.**

Already on the morning of this day (June 19th), the Nuremberg legates had written: "Yesterday before breakfast your two latest letters were answered by us. Then we went first to our gracious lord, the Margrave, and afterwards to our gracious lord, the Elector. In both places we find that his Electoral, and his Princely, Grace, hears with pleasure that your Excellencies will unite with their Princely Graces. They also graciously declare that in this matter they will associate you with themselves, and will allow the affairs of his Electoral, and of his Princely, Grace, and of your Excellencies, to go together; and though Margrave George was clearer and franker with his answer and promise than the Saxon, yet we do not anticipate any failure on the part of the Saxon. * * * We also to the best of our ability heartily thanked the Elector for having granted us a copy of his Electoral Grace's Confession. Philip Melanchthon has announced that the matter will possibly not require such an elaborate treatment, but that it may be abridged and handled more briefly. But whatever shall be done, whether the former Confession shall be completed, or another one made, you shall be informed."†

This letter shows that the Nurebergers are still pressing the matter of concerted action; that up to this time, June 19th, such

*Coelestin, *Historia* I., p. 102; Schirrmacher, p. 72.

†C. R. II., 112. Compare the letter of June 15th, p. 32 above.

contemplated action includes only the Nurenbergers, Margrave George and the Elector; that there is an element of uncertainty in the Elector, and hence that concert of action has not yet been agreed upon; that the Confession is still called "the Confession of his Electoral Grace," and hence has not become common property among the Evangelical Estates; that the Confession has not yet been completed; that Melanchthon is uncertain about the future of the Confession, that is, as to whether it shall be completed and used or not.

That nothing was done on Sunday, 19th, after this letter was written, nor on Monday, 20th, in furtherance of concerted action as touching the Confession, nor towards the completion of the Confession, is demonstrably certain; for, Tuesday afternoon, June 21st, these Nurenberg legates write: "Since our last letter nothing further has been done."* They then describe the opening of the Diet, Monday 20th, and Melanchthon's interview with Valdesius, the Imperial Secretary, who proposed that the whole matter should be treated briefly and privately. Not one word do they write about the Confession, or about concert of action, except to say that "nothing further has been done." The letter is finished at 5 o'clock, P. M.

It is thus demonstrable that up to so late an hour as 5 o'clock P. M. Tuesday, June 21st, these faithful and watchful Nurenberg legates not only know "nothing further" about concert of action, about a common confession, about the completion of the Saxon Confession, but they expressly report that "nothing further has been done" about these matters, for it is of these matters that they write, as the reference to their "last letter," which reports as its chief items the *status quo* of such things, plainly proves.

THE OPENING OF THE DIET.

The Nurenberg legates report the opening of the Diet as follow: "Monday the Mass of the Holy Ghost was sung at the Cathedral in the presence of all the Estates. Especially were the Elector of Saxony, Margrave George, Hessen and Lüneburg present, and they attended his majesty in all the

*C. R. II., 121.

ceremonies. After the service the Apostolic Nuncio (Vincentius Pimpinelli), in behalf of the Pope, from a lofty platform erected before the High Altar, delivered to the Emperor and the Imperial Estates a Latin oration more than an hour long, and admonished them most earnestly to resist the Turk and to put an end to the schism of the faith, and to settle other matters in the Empire.

"Then the Emperor, the King and all the Electors, Princes and Estates, adjourned to the *Rathhaus*, where *Duke Frederick*, in behalf of the Emperor, made a short address, and opened the Diet, and read the Programme according to which the Emperor would conduct the affairs of the Diet. Thereupon the Electors and Princes through Margrave *Joachim* delivered in reply an address expressive of loyalty and obedience. It was decided to give a copy of the Emperor's Programme (*Vorhalten*) to the Electors, Princes and Estates, that they might consider it and afterwards come together and consult. After this the Emperor and all the Estates, at 1 o'clock, P. M., so long had the session lasted, left the house."*

The Imperial Programme, or Proposition, in accordance with which the Diet was to be conducted, consists of two distinct parts. The first asks for a continuance of aid against the Turk. The second demands, *inter alia*, that the Electors, Princes and Estates shall present a written statement in German and Latin of their views and opinions touching the errors and abuses in religion.

It was the intention, evidently, of the Emperor to take up the Turkish question first. But the Evangelical Princes and Estates were of a different mind, and determined to reverse the order of the Programme.† They regarded the religious question as of paramount importance. Hence we are not surprised to learn

*For fuller and more minute accounts of the opening of the Diet, see Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, 73-5. Coelestin's *Historia* I., 103 *et seqq.*; Chytraeus' *Historia*, p. 52. The Imperial Programme, (*Vorhalten*), or *Propositio* as it is called in Latin, see for the German, Schirrmacher, pp. 79-81; J. J. Müller's *Historie*, pp. 564 *et seqq.*; Förstemann, I., pp. 306 *et seqq.*; for the Latin, Coelestin, I., pp. 120-121; Chytraeus, pp. 53-60.

†Schirrmacher, p. 81.

that "on the same day, [that is, on the afternoon of June 20th,] the Elector John assembled his allies in religion at his lodgings and exhorted them in an earnest and solemn address, faithfully and fearlessly to stand by and defend the cause of God and the pure religion, and not to allow themselves, through any threats or intimidations to be led to deny the same, since all machinations against God will be impotent, and the good cause will at length undoubtedly triumph."*

The supreme hour had now come, and yet still we nowhere read of an agreement on the part of the Evangelicals to present a *common* confession, nor of any invitation from the Elector to his co-religionists to accept *his* Confession and to join him in a *common* presentation. But the great and good man soon comprehended the magnitude of the situation, and resolved upon the step that brought about perfect unity of action among those who held the same evangelical faith. Coelestin has given the following account of the manner in which the Elector spent the next day, June 21st: "On the twenty-first day of the same month the Elector of Saxony, having sent all his counsellors and attendants from his presence, alone in secret read the Psalter, and most fervently prayed God, for the glory of his name and for the salvation of many souls, to assist, promote, advance and defend the cause of true religion.

"He also wrote down his good, pious reflections. These were given by John Dolsch, the Electoral Counsellor, to Melanchthon, who read them with admiration and returned them. The Elector's autograph was subsequently exhibited by Dolsch at Leipzig to many learned and honorable men, who read it.

"The same day about 8 o'clock, A. M., he carefully, alone, examined and pondered the Proposition which at the opening of the Diet had been read by order of the Emperor to all the Orders and Estates of the Empire. A little later, when about to take refreshments, he called in his son John Frederick, Philip Melanchthon and Dr. Pontanus (Brück), and conferred with them very confidentially about religion, and made known his plans, distinctly affirming that he would neither confer nor act in polit-

*Coelestin's *Historia* I., 121-2. See Müller, *Historie*, p. 568.

ical matters, except the cause of religion be first taken up for decision and determination, and yet he would make no pronunciamento without the advice of his allies in religion. Therefore, at 2 o'clock, P. M., he summons to his quarters the Estates kindred in religion. When all these had assembled at the appointed time, Duke John the Elector, ordered Doctor Pontanus to read the Proposition to all the Evangelical Orders present, with a loud and distinct utterance, so that each one could hear, understand and ponder it, and could declare publicly and make known his opinion concerning it. When the Proposition had been read, the Evangelical Estates say that they are diligently considering the whole subject, and that they wish to meet the Prince Elector the next day and to counsel with him."*

THE EVANGELICAL ESTATES AGREE TO PRESENT A COMMON CONFESSION.

The narrative by Coelestin shows that it was not until the forenoon of June 21st that the Elector made known his intention of taking his co-religionists into formal alliance with himself, and that it was not until the afternoon of that day that the alliance was consummated. We shall now show that it was not until the afternoon of that same day that it was agreed to make the Saxon Confession the *common* confession of the Evangelical Estates.

As already stated, the Nurenberg legates wrote to their senate on the afternoon of June 21st, finishing their letter at 5 o'clock, (see p. 36), and say that "nothing further had been done since their last letter." They then add a "Postscript," written the same evening, and say: "After we had finished this letter, I, Kress, was summoned to the Elector's quarters. His Electoral Grace, Margrave George and the counsellors of Hesse and Lüneberg were there. They declare simply that inasmuch as the Elector has already had a Confession of faith composed, a copy of which you have received, they have presented themselves before the Elector and Margrave George for the purpose of joining the Elector. They are now holding a session over those articles,

*Coelestin, *Historia*, p. 122; Müller, *Historie*, p. 568; Cyprian, p. 65.

for the purpose of further revising, composing and finishing them.* It is the desire of the Princes that your Excellencies should immediately send your preachers, or whom you will, but especially Osiander, and would instruct them to help us to consider and to deliberate over these articles and whatever else is needed in the transaction."

This "Postscript" supplements and confirms the report quoted above from Coelestin, since both reports recite the transactions of the same persons, viz., of the Elector and the other Evangelical Estates, on the same afternoon, viz., that of Tuesday, June 21st, and at the same place, viz., at the lodgings of the Elector. Kress, the Nurenberg legate, was present at this Tuesday-afternoon meeting of the Princes and Estates, and writes, as an eyewitness, the items which he regards as the most important, viz., the consummation of the Nurenberg-Margrave plan of a common confession and of united action. He reports officially that it has now been decided to make the *Saxon* Confession the common confession of the Evangelicals, and that to that end the articles are being further *revised, composed and finished* by the Princes and their representatives.†

*Die weiter zu übersehen, zu stellen und zu beschliesen. We have translated *stellen*, "composing," since it is certain that in two places in this letter the word is used with that meaning. It may mean here *to arrange, to set in order*. *Beschliesen* which is here translated "finishing," may mean to *decide upon, to vote on*. The sentence taken as a whole reports careful, protracted, formal and official action on the Confession by the assembled Princes and their counsellors, and gives the first report we have of such joint action; as the "Postscript" itself marks the hour when union was consummated, 5 o'clock, P. M., June 21st. Of this there can be no question, since the report is official, and was made at the time when, and the place where the consummation of union was effected.

†This account is confirmed by Chancellor Brück, who wrote a history of the Diet of Augsburg, though he condenses in a single paragraph the account of the transactions of June 21st to June 23rd. He says: "Then the five, the Elector and the Princes, who were now obligated to present their Confession, and that too in three days, that is, on Friday, they, their preachers and their learned men, made ready therefor. But fearing lest they could not get ready and make a clean copy, since there was so much of it, so as to deliver it on Friday, they importuned the Imperial Chancellor, the Elector of Mayence, to have the matter deferred one day. He informed them that he would do it, were it in his power. But the Emperor

Hence it is not until this Tuesday evening after 5 o'clock, that we have what may be called the *relatively finished* Augsburg Confession, though Melanchthon, so the historians constantly affirm, continued to make changes in it up to the last hour before delivery. The Imperial Proposition had made a like demand of each Prince and Estate. On the side of the Evangelicals only the Elector of Saxony was in a situation to meet that demand; for he alone had in readiness a carefully prepared statement touching the matters in dispute. After devout prayer, mature deliberation, and conference with trusted advisers, he resolves to act in concert with his co-religionists, and so invites them to a conference which *results in their acceptance and adoption of his Confession as their Confession*. A common danger, the consciousness of being one in their faith, a common obligation to obey the Imperial command, had brought them to see the wisdom and the desirability of having and of presenting a common confession. How far into the evening, or the night, of Tuesday 21st, they continued their work of elaboration and revision, we do not know, but we do know that such work was not yet completed.

had decided to hear the Papal legate, Cardinal Campeggius, on Friday, St. John's Day, and that then they would be expected to make answer. Hence a change could not be made. Then the Elector and Princes had to submit, and had to make ready their articles, so far as they could do so in such haste. And because the legates of the cities of Nurenberg and Reutlingen had been instructed to join the Elector and the Princes, they with and after the Elector and Princes signed the articles," pp. 50, 51. We have here again the positive proof that very much work remained to be done on the Confession after it had been decided by the Protestants, June 21st, to unite in a common confession.

Chancellor Gregory Brück's *Geschichte der Religionshandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg in J. 1530*, is found in Foerstemann's *Archiv fuer die Geschichte der Kirchlichen Reformation*. Halle, 1831. 1. Band, 1. Heft. The copy used by us was kindly loaned from the "Neander Library" in the Rochester Theological Seminary. This History is of great value, as it was written by one of the most active and influential officials at the Diet. J. J. Müller has quoted extensively from it as *Auctor Apologiae Manuscriptae*. It was also used by Cyprian.

THE CONFESSION FINISHED AND SIGNED.

Coelestin, after reciting what was done by the Elector and Estates, as quoted above on p. 38, continues right on, as follows : "When, therefore, on the following day (June 22d), the Protestants came together, it was unanimously agreed, after deliberation, that no action should be taken touching political matters until religion and the Christian faith had been treated and decided upon, and that they would not assent to the demands of the Emperor to continue aid against the Turk until they had treated of, and reached a decision in regard to, the articles of faith and the peace of the Christian Church." He then recites the Response made by the Princes to the Imperial Proposition, in which Response the declaration is made that attention must be first given in the Diet to the cause of religion. He then proceeds as follows : "When, therefore, the Emperor had been informed of these things (contained in the Response) he commanded the Elector of Saxony and the other Princes allied in religion to offer and to present to him the written Confession and summary of their faith, and to exhibit the methods by which they thought to correct and to remove the abuses in the Church.

"On the Vigil of John the Baptist, Thursday, June 23d, at the request of the Elector of Saxony, the articles of the Confession were read in a large assembly of the Evangelical Orders, with the purpose and intent especially, that if any one thought anything in them ought to be changed, he might speak freely and candidly and might so declare. When the reading was ended, and they (the articles of the Confession) were approved by all, it was decided to ask the Emperor the next day, to consent to have them read in the presence of all the Orders of the Empire."*

This narrative of facts is confirmed by the official letter of the Nurenberg legates, who were present at, and took part in, this meeting of Thursday, June 23d. Early on the morning of Saturday, June 25th, they reported to their senate. After reciting that on Wednesday the Evangelical Estates had decided to demand that the subject of religion should take precedence of every-

*Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 123b. See Müller's *Historie*, p. 569; also Brück's *Geschichte*, pp. 49, 50.

thing else, they report as follows: "Last Thursday morning, we and the legate from Reutlingen were summoned into the presence of the Saxon, the Hessian, Margrave George and Lüneburg. There in the presence of all their Princely Graces, counsellors and theologians—there were twelve theologians, besides other scholars and doctors,—the afore-mentioned Confession of faith was read, examined and considered, so that it could be read yesterday afternoon to the Emperor in the presence of the Estates of the Empire. Then because the copying, and the composition (Stellen) of the Preface and Conclusion, consumed considerable time, the Elector and Princes through their counsellors, besought the Emperor for an extension of time. But this was denied them, and yesterday at three o'clock in the afternoon the Emperor and all the Estates came to the house,"* that is, the *Rathaus*, as we know from other accounts that this second session of the Diet was held at that place.

No less than four efforts were made that Friday afternoon, June 24th, by the Evangelicals to have their Confession read before the Emperor and the assembled Estates of the Empire; but they were crowded out by a speech from the Papal Legate, Cardinal Campeggius, by the speeches of the legates of Lower Austria, by the growing lateness of the hour, and by the Emperor's unwillingness to have the Confession *read*, and his wish to have it left with him. But the Evangelicals "vehemently insisted" that they must be allowed to *read* their Confession, and finally that they must be allowed to retain it over night "in order properly to revise and correct it, since they had been hurried."† The Nurenberg legates then go on to say in this their letter of Saturday morning, June 25th: "The Confession, in so far as the articles of faith are concerned, is in substance al-

*C. R. II., 127. See a lengthy account of this second session of the Diet, June 24th, in Coelestin's *Historia*, I., 123 b *et seqq.* Engelhardt, speaking of the report of the Nurenbergers, says: "The Protocol of June 23rd describes the last act of completion." Niedner's *Zeitschrift* (1865), p. 577.

†See the letter of the Nurenbergers in C. R. II., pp. 127-130; Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 124-134; Chytraeus, *Historia*, pp. 61-69; Schirrmacher, 82-3; Cyprian *Historia*, Beylagen, VI., p. 76, Beylagen, IX., pp. 105 *et seqq.*; Brück's *Geschichte*, pp. 51 *et seqq.*

most in accord with what we have already sent you; but in some parts it is improved, and everywhere it is made as mild as possible though in our judgment, nothing necessary has been omitted.* Hence we have agreed to all this, and in your name have joined the Princes and Reutlingen."†

*Melanchthon wrote to Camerarius, June 26th: "I was changing and making over many things daily, and would have made more changes, had our counsellors permitted it; and so far am I from judging that I have written too mildly, I fear that some have been offended by our boldness. For Valdesius, the Imperial Secretary, saw it before we presented it, and thought it was so sharp that the adversary could not tolerate it." C. R. II., p. 140.

†C. R. II., p. 120. The authentic documentary facts recited in the text in the pages above show how incorrect and unreliable are certain statements made by Dr. Krauth: "The 'form of the Confession' sent on May 11th was the Augsburg Confession substantially identical with it as a whole, and in all that is really essential to it verbally identical." *Conservative Reformation*, p. 226.

Again: Writing of Melanchthon's letter of May 22nd (LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Vol. XXIX., p. 523) he says: "This letter shows:

1. "That Melanchthon desired Luther to know all that he was doing.
2. "That the Articles of Faith were finished, and that the changes were confined to the Articles on Abuses." *Ibid*, p. 228. As a matter of fact Melanchthon did not write a word to Luther about the Confession from May 22nd to June 25th, and yet he and other learned men were daily making changes in it. Article XX., one of the most important in the entire Confession, and perhaps Article XXI., the Preface and Conclusion, were composed after May 22nd as the Nurenberg Protocol clearly shows. The Protocol, and Melanchthon's letter of June 26th to Camerarius, speak of daily changes that were made. It is purely gratuitous to say that these "were confined to the Articles on Abuses." Also: The official and other contemporary documents in hand, from which we have so liberally quoted in the text, put the eternal quietus on Dr. Krauth's theory, viz., that some time after June 14th, 1530, in an assembly of the Princes, other officials, and preachers, the Confession was discussed and determined upon sentence by sentence in order, and then in its "final form" was sent to Luther for his examination, was received back again with his approval, and after that was delivered to the Emperor. See *Conservative Reformation*, p. 232-3; *First Free Lutheran Dict in America*, pp. 238 *et seqq.*, particularly p. 240; *A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession*, pp. 54 *et seqq.*, particularly p. 61: "The German Formula is submitted June 14, and after this comes the discussion mentioned by Melanchthon."

Dr. Krauth bases his theory of a *third* sending to Luther, etc., on a paragraph in Melanchthon's Latin Preface (written February 16th, 1560) to the *Corpus Doctrinae*. The German Preface to the German *Corpus Doctrinae* was written September 29th, 1559. They are both given

We thus see that the Augsburg Confession was *revised, corrected and improved* up to the last hour before its delivery. The proof by which this proposition is established is documentary also in C. R. IX., respectively at pp. 929 *et seqq.*, and 1050 *et seqq.* We submit a translation of the German section in question, and the Latin paragraph with Dr. Krauth's translation of the same:

"Finally this Confession, so God ordained and granted, was composed by myself, and the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther declared that it pleased him. But prior to its being publicly read before the Emperor, it was laid before the Elector, the Princes, and legates, who subscribed it. These, with their counsellors and preachers, who were present, diligently pondered all the Articles. As now the Emperor required an answer, this Confession was read publicly in the presence of the Emperor and of all the Electors, Princes and Counsellors, who were at the Diet. Then the copy was given to the Emperor who had it read again in his own council."

Congessi igitur simplici studio capita Confessionis quae extat, complexus pene summam doctrinae Ecclesiarum nostrarum, et ut Imperatori responderetur, et ut falsa crimina depellerentur. Ac nihil mihi sumi. Praesentibus Principibus, et aliis gubernatoribus et concionatoribus, disputatum est ordine de singulis sententiis. Missa est deinde et Luther tota forma Confessionis, qui Principibus scripsit, se hanc Confessionem et legisse et probare. Haec ita acta esse, Principes, et alii honesti et docti viri adhuc superstites meminerunt. Postea coram Imperatore Carolo, in magna frequentia Principum, lecta est haec confessio, quod ostendit non esse obtrusam Caesari non poscenti.

DR. KRAUTH'S TRANSLATION.

"I. 'I brought together the principal points of the Confession, embracing pretty nearly the sum of the doctrines of our Churches.'

"II. 'I assumed nothing to myself, for in the presence of the Princes and other officials, and of the preachers, it was discussed and determined upon in regular order, sentence by sentence.'

"III. 'The complete form of the Confession was subsequently sent to Luther, who wrote to the Princes that he had read the Confession and approved it. That these things were so done, the Princes, and other honest and learned men, *yet living*, well remember.'

"IV. "After this (*postea*) before the Emperor Charles, in a great assemblage of the Princes, this Confession was read."

Dr. Krauth follows his translation *immediately* with the following statement and explanation: "This extract shows, 1. that this complete Confession—the *tota forma*—the Articles on Doctrines and Abuses, as contrasted with any earlier and imperfect form of the Confession, was submitted to Luther." "2. This is wholly distinct from Luther's endorsement of the Confession as sent May 11th, for that was not the '*tota forma*,' but relatively unfinished; that had not been discussed before Princes,

and official. The facts were written down at the time by those who participated in the transactions, and were reported to the Nurenberg Senate. These facts in their essential parts are *officials, and preachers, for they were not yet at Augsburg.*" *Conservative Reformation*, p. 233. See also "*First Free Lutheran Diet in America*," pp. 238-240.

1. The critical reader will observe that Dr. Krauth has failed to translate a part of the Latin extract without giving notice of any omission.

2. That he has divided his translation into paragraphs, whereas the original is a single paragraph. If no advantage had been sought for the theory by such paragraphing, why was it made?

3. In the translation certain words are italicized. There are no italics in the original.

4. The translation of *disputatum, est ordine de singulis sententiis* by, "it was discussed and determined upon in regular course, sentence by sentence," is more than questionable. But we leave the question of the accuracy of such a translation to Latin scholars; and the question as to whether such a translation can fairly represent the facts in the case, we leave with those who have carefully studied the facts of the transactions of June 15th-21st given in the text above, and in the *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* for July 1897, pp. 323-6, and July 1898, pp. 387 *et seqq.*

5. Melanchthon wrote *tota forma Confessionis*. Dr. Krauth in his explanation makes "*tota forma*" the equivalent of "complete Confession." He thus fails to observe the difference (recognized by every logician) between the *form* of a thing and the *thing itself*, in this case the difference between the *tota forma Confessionis* and the *tota Confessio*. Melanchthon was too good a logician to make such confusion. He does not say the *tota Confessio*, the "complete Confession," was sent to Luther, but the *tota forma Confessionis* was sent. We know that the *tota forma Confessionis*, *Der fertige Entwurf, Prima Acumbratio*, was sent to Luther, May 11th, and was approved by him. Of any other, that is, of a *second*, or of a *third*, sending of the Confession to Luther, we have no record whatever, either from the pen of Melanchthon, or from that of any other contemporaneous writer. The German Preface, and the Latin Preface, speaks each of *only one* submission of the Confession to Luther. This is the important, the *essential* thing, the *one* sending. Had there been more than one sending, Melanchthon would have falsified history by writing in his two prefaces as he did. The prefaces differ somewhat as to the order of events, but not as to the fact of a *single* submission. The German Preface, as every scholar will perceive, is more specific than the Latin, and follows in a more orderly way the course of events as given in the "Protocol," and in other documents quoted in the text above. It is very manifest that in the German Preface Melanchthon has in mind the meetings of the Evangelicals, June 21st and 23d, and the fact that *prior* to such meetings the Confession had been approved by Luther. In the Latin Preface he says: *Praesentibus Principibus, et gubernatoribus et concionatoribus disputatum est*,—a rather general statement.

firmed by the official report of the Frankfort a. M. legates to their senate, and by the official report of the Strassburg legates to their Senate. They cannot now be called in question.

In the retinue of the Elector, which reached Augsburg, May 2nd, were the following persons, named by J. J. Müller, in his *Historie*, pp. 455-56, who took the list from the official records:

"I. PRINCES.

1. The Electoral Prince, Duke John Fröderick.
2. Duke Francis of Lüneburg.
3. Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt.

[These three, together with the Elector, signed the Confession.]

"COUNTS AND LORDS.

1. Count Albert of Mansfeld.
2. Count Ernst of Gleichen.
3. Count Jobst of Mansfeld.
4. The Lord of Wildenfels.

"III. NOBLE COUNSELLORS.

1. Frederick von Thun.
2. Sebastian and } Marshals of Pappenheim.
3. Joachim,
4. Hans von Minckwitz.
5. Hans von Weissenbach.
6. Conrad Gossmann.
7. Ewald von Brandenstein.

"IV. LEARNED COUNSELLORS.

1. Dr. Gregory Brück, Chancellor.
2. Dr. Christian Baier, Chancellor.
3. Christopher Gross.

"V. NOBLES.

Seven Knights and seventy noblemen.

"VI. MINISTERS.

1. Dr. Martin Luther, who was left at Coburg.
2. Justus Jonas.
3. George Spalatin.
4. Philip Melanchthon.
5. John Agricola, who was brought by Count Albert of Mansfeld."

Dr. Feige (Ficulnus) the Hessian Chancellor, and Erhard Schnepf, Chaplain of the Landgrave of Hesse, came to Augsburg May 3rd, (C. R. II., 39, Jonas's *Briefwechsel* I., p. 148.) Thus every condition required by the Praesentibus Principibus *et al.* is supplied by May 11th, and yet Dr. Krauth says (*Conservative Reformation*, p. 233): "That (that is, the form of the Confession sent to Luther, May 11th: see above) had not been discussed before Princes, officials, and preachers, *for they were not yet at*

Hence to speak of an Augsburg Confession or of a common confession of the Lutherans *prior* to June 21st, 1530, is to speak unhistorically and inaccurately, for *prior* to that date, it *was*, and

Augsburg," (Italics ours.) How is that for history,—"*they were not yet at Augsburg*"?; and how did Dr. Krauth *know* that the form of the Confession sent to Luther May 11th had not been first thoroughly discussed before Princes, officials, and preachers? Where is the document that says it was not so discussed? and does the reader for one moment suppose that the *tota forma*, or any other form, of the Confession would be sent to Luther May 11th, without having been first thoroughly discussed?

But we are not disposed to refer Melanchthon's statement—*Praesentibus Principibus et al.*—*exclusively* to any one particular meeting and discussion. Melanchthon evidently means to say that prior to the delivery of the Confession to the Emperor, every article of it was discussed in an orderly way before the *Princes et al.*—"Diligently pondered all the articles"—*German Preface*. We know from the contemporaneous official reports that the Confession received such discussion, June 21st and June 23rd. We know from the Nurenberg "Protocol" that on other occasions the Saxon officials and theologians held daily sessions over the Confession. But there can be no doubt that in both prefaces Melanchthon had in mind *chiefly* the meetings and discussions of June 21st and 23rd for these unquestionably were the most important meetings held by the *Princes et al.* over the Confession, since at the former the Confession formally *ceased* to be the Confession of the Elector alone, and became *formally* and *really* the common Confession of the Evangelicals, and at the latter meeting it "was read, examined and considered." Such meetings could not possibly have been overlooked, or ignored, or forgotten, by Melanchthon, in making a record of the genesis of the Confession. Moreover, it is demonstrably certain from the "Postscript" of the Nurenberg "Protocol" (see text p. 39) that the Confession *did not become the common property of the Evangelicals, until late in the afternoon of June 21st*—for they, the counsellors of Hesse and Lüneburg, distinctly say "that they have presented themselves before the Elector and Margrave George for the purpose of joining the Elector,"—and then it would have been *too late to send the "complete Confession"* to Luther, and to get it back with his approval in time for its delivery to the Emperor, June 25th, since it is universally admitted that it required from six to eight days to make the trip from Augsburg to Coburg and return.

6. Dr. Krauth says: "The German Formula is submitted June 14th, and after this comes the discussion mentioned by Melanchthon, with the express inference from the 'deinde' that it 'was sent again, as it seems.' " *A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession*, p. 61. There can be no doubt that the discussion mentioned by Melanchthon has its *chief* reference to something that occurred after June 14th. In so far we entirely agree with Dr. Krauth. But: (a.) In the many official documents, private and official accounts, relating to and reporting the transactions of June 15th to

was still *called*, the Saxon Confession, and was *incomplete*. Prior to that date the other Protestant Princes and Estates had *not even been invited* by the Elector to accept *his* Confession as

20th, including the latter date, there is no record, nor even the shadow of an intimation, of the occurrence of such a discussion. (See text, p. 39). (b.) It has been shown in the text that during those six eventful days the Princes, other officials, and the preachers were so strenuously and continually occupied day and night, (some of them were called out of bed late at night, C. R. II., 106,) that no time could possibly have been left to them for any such discussion as the theory presupposes—"sentence by sentence," for since it took Dr. Beyer two hours to read the Confession before the Emperor, it would have taken more than ten times two hours to discuss it "sentence by sentence," since it contains more than four hundred sentences. If we be not mistaken this is a case of *reductio ad absurdum*.

(c.) June 20th Luther at Coburg wrote to Jonas that for three full weeks he had not heard a word from Augsburg (De Wette IV., p. 45.) Had the "complete Confession" been sent to Luther June 15th or 16th or 17th, it would have had, at the least, four days in which to reach Coburg by the evening of the 20th. That it did not come prior to the 20th is certain. That it did not come on the 20th is certainly an "express inference" from the fact that in the three letters written by Luther on that day, respectively to the Landgrave of Hesse, to Erhard Schnepf, to Justus Jonas (De Wette IV., 23, 44, 45) there is not even any allusion to the Confession, nor to the reception on that day of any communication from Augsburg, except the letter from Jonas; nor is there extant any letter from Prince, official or theologian, at Augsburg to Luther, written after June 13th till June 19th (that of Melanchthon in which there is no allusion to the Confession, C. R. II., 118), except that of Jonas, dated June 18th, quoted above in a note. Nor is there any letter extant from Luther to any Prince, official or theologian, at Augsburg, written after June 20th till June 25th, the day on which the Confession was publicly read; nor is there any evidence that any letter or communication from the places named above to any of the persons named above, written during the intervals mentioned above, has been lost.

Again: Had Luther, prior to writing the Landgrave, June 20th, (see p. 31 n), received the Confession in its "final form," as it had been "discussed and determined upon in the presence of Princes" *et al.*,—and such discussion, etc., would certainly have been reported to him in sending the Confession,—he would most certainly have made some allusion to the Confession in writing the Landgrave about the Zwinglians. Nay, rather, he would not have written him at all, since in his relations to the Confession there would have been proof positive that the Landgrave had forsaken the Zwinglians. And had the Princes received a letter from Luther just before June 25th, approving the Confession, some allusion or reference would undoubtedly have been made to it in the Elector's letter of June 25th,

theirs, and to join him in a common declaration of the doctrine preached and taught in the churches of their respective dominions. The Nurenberg letter of June 21st, beginning: "Since

(given in Schirrmacher, pp. 87-89) to Luther. But the whole tone and content of the letter shows that nothing had been heard or received from Luther in the recent past.

This, we know, is the argument from silence; but when the silence appears just where speech is most appropriate, and is required by the circumstances, on the supposition that the Confession had been recently sent to, and returned by, Luther,—the argument from silence is conclusive, unless met by clear statements and known facts to the contrary.

7. Suppose that Luther received the "complete Confession" from Augsburg, June 20th, (we have demonstrated that he could not have received it earlier)—suppose for the sake of argument that he received it June 20th, and examined it the same day, and returned it with his approval the next day, what then? Why this: It could not possibly have reached Augsburg in time to influence the final decision, for there is no evidence that any letter sent from Coburg to Augsburg reached its destination in less than four days. Already on the afternoon of June 21st the Princes *et al.* were engaged in making a final revision of the Confession—*Die weiter zu ueberschreiten, zu stellen und zu beschliessen*. Thursday, June 23d, that final revision was completed, and the Confession was *signed*, and became to all intents and purposes the "complete Confession," the Augsburg Confession of History.

But it is demonstrable that Luther did not receive the Confession, June 20th, in its "final form" as it had been "discussed and determined upon in the presence of Princes" *et al.*, in the sense of Dr. Krauth's theory; for the simple reason that up to June 19th, (see the "Protocol," p. 35 in the text above), the Elector had not even unequivocally *promised* to take his co-religionists into alliance with himself. Hence up to that time there was no meeting of the Princes and other officials (the Nurenberg and Reutlingen legates as Dr. Krauth interprets *gubernatores*) to discuss and determine upon the Confession in the sense of Dr. Krauth's theory. And had such meeting taken place June 19th or 20th, the Nurenberg legates would not have written, June 21st: "Since our last letter, [June 19th, early in the morning], nothing further has been done," (C. R. II., 121); that is, nothing further has been done about the Confession and about the proposed alliance.

8. June 23d, when the articles had been "approved by all and each, it was decided"—decretum fuit—to ask the Emperor to allow the Confession to be read before all the orders of the Empire (Coelestin, *Historia*, I., 123b). This shows that the Princes *et al.* were not awaiting word from Luther. And when they sought to have the reading deferred a day, it was not that they might hear from Luther, but that they might finish the Confession and make a clean copy. So says Chancellor Brück, who was too honorable to falsify, and, writing some months after the adjournment of the Diet, could have had no reason for keeping back a part of the truth,

our last letter nothing further has been done," and its "Postscript," remove all question as to the very afternoon on which union was consummated. There is no way of escaping this and such an important part as this would have been. Brück's *Geschichte*, p. 50.

June 24th they "insisted vehemently" (heftig angehalten, say the Nurenbergers, C. R. II., 128; vehementissime urgent et obsecrant, Schirrmacher, p. 83; Landgravius plane hoc dimicavit et ursit, ut coram statibus imperii et Caesare articuli praelegerentur et voce recitarentur, writes Jonas, *Briefwechsel* I., 163), that their Confession might be read *at that time*. This is equal to a demonstration that they were not expecting anything from Luther; nor is there to be found a single word in the many and full accounts of the transactions of June 21st, 22nd, 23d, that indicates that anything had been sent to Luther, or that anything was awaited from Luther, as preliminary to responding to the Imperial Proposition issued, June 20th. This, we think, is another case of *reductio ad absurdum*, that is, in view of all the known facts, Dr. Krauth's theory seems absurd.

But the whole theory is shown to be without historical basis by the "Postscript" in the Nurenberg "Protocol," June 21st—everywhere ignored by Dr. Krauth—which "Postscript," (taken in connection with the Nurenbergers' letter of June 19th), makes it historically *demonstrable* that it was not until that day that the Princes *et al.* UNITED on the Saxon Confession as their common Confession, and THEN in the Elector's lodgings began the work of final revision and of completing the Confession—a work which was practically concluded two days later. Indeed, that "Postscript" alone decides the matter, for it makes it as clear as the sunlight that "absolute unity of presentation" (Dr. Krauth's phrase) was not agreed upon until late in the afternoon of June 21st, and that on that afternoon the Confession was undergoing a thorough revision, which was completed on the 23rd. Hence well does J. J. Müller say that during those days "they worked almost day and night in completing and copying the Confession." *Historie*, p. 571.

Again: Dr. Krauth says that "'gubernatores' * * * refers especially to the government officials, the legates who represented Nürnberg and Reutlingen." *A Chronicle*, p. 83. Be it so, (for the sake of argument.) But we know with documentary certainty, by official report, that the first meeting of the Princes *et al.* attended by any Nurenberg legate (Kress) in whose "presence" the Confession "was discussed and determined upon in order," was that of June 21st, (see the "Postscript,") and the first meeting of the kind at which the Reutlingen legate is known to have been present was that of June 23d. (C. R. II., 127.) Dr. Krauth's explanation is thus shown to be fatal to his theory.

While we hazard nothing in saying that the "Postscript" alone furnishes the all-sufficient instrument for a complete refutation of Dr. Krauth's theory of a third sending, in that it enables us to fix the very hour in which "absolute unity of presentation" was agreed upon, we have nevertheless

conclusion except by impeaching the veracity of the Nurenberg legates.

What changes were made in the Confession, June 21st and adduced the other facts for the purpose of showing that the theory is absolutely destitute of historical basis; that it is contradicted by all the known facts relating to the times, circumstances and conditions subsequent to June 14th,—in a word that it is the figment of a fertile brain, which has ignored official testimony, and much other original documentary evidence, and, in opposition to the usage of the most eminent scholars—some of them Melanchthon's own pupils and commensals—for two hundred years, has put its own interpretation on Melanchthon's Latin Preface—which is sufficiently explained by the German Preface which, so far as we can learn, has not been quoted, except in isolated words and phrases. Let him that would now defend the theory adduce the facts to prove it,—let him prove that Melanchthon in his two prefaces means to affirm that the Confession was sent to Luther before its delivery more than *once*; that the sending implied in the German Preface was different from that expressed in the Latin Preface; that the Confession reached Luther on or after June 20th,—for no earlier date is possible; that it and Luther's letter of approval to the Princes reached Augsburg before the Confession was publicly read in "the great assemblage of the Princes." It is to the proof of the matter in exactly such form that the defender of the theory must address himself.

But it must be understood that we have not undertaken to prove a negative. We are no more required by the laws of logic and the rules of debate to prove that the "complete Confession" was *not* sent to Luther after June 14th, and before its delivery, than we are required to prove that it was not at the same time sent to the Pope at Rome. We have undertaken to show, and we believe we have shown, that the known facts leave no room for the theory; and we know of not a single modern German historian of the Confession who *asserts* or *defends* such a theory, (for a seeming exception, see Francke, below.)

9. On pp. 56 *et seqq.* in the *A Chronicle of the Augsburg Confession*, Dr. Krauth discussed the "*Character and Value of Melanchthon's Testimony*," that is, of the Latin Preface-Extract now under consideration. He then names, pp. 56, 57, twenty authors between 1570 and 1867, by whom "and by many others," this Extract has been "quoted." Of the character and value of this Extract there never has been a question. It is both genuine and authentic. That is, Melanchthon is its author, and its author's name is the sufficient guarantee for the correctness of its statements, not, however, for Dr. Krauth's interpretation.

Many readers of the *A Chronicle*, we happen to know, have supposed that Dr. Krauth adduced these authorities as interpreting Melanchthon's Preface in support of a *third* sending, etc. We have before us, as we write, all of these authorities (except those numbered 6, 9, 10, 11, 16, two of which are Reformed) and "many others" not named by Dr. Krauth. With two exceptions these authorities now before us employ this extract in sup-

June 23rd, and even later, we know not. We know that it was made as "mild as possible." Had its delivery to the Emperor been delayed, unquestionably it would have been changed still further, since it was the express policy of Melanchthon to adapt it to circumstances.

Hence we see that the authority of the Confession does not port of one, or other, or all, of the propositions: That Melanchthon assumed nothing to himself; that he consulted with Luther and others; that the Confession was sent to Luther before it was publicly read. Some of them (see especially those incomparable scholars and historians of the Confession, Kirchner, Selneccer and Chemnitz, the two last, pupils of Melanchthon, *Gruendliche Historia*, p. 109; Carpzov, *Isagoge*, pp. 104, 105; Salig, *Historia*, A. C. p. 168; Boerner, *institutiones*, p. 42; Danz. *Die Augsb. Conf.* pp. 6, 9, 10,) employ it in express connection with the sending of May 11th, *which nobody ever disputed*. Hence so far are these learned authorities from supporting the theory of a *third* sending, etc., that they are *properly* quoted only when they are quoted *directly* against such a theory.

Walch (Dr. Krauth's 17) refers to the Preface-Extract in a second-hand, and hence in a most unscholarly way, and then says: "Thus revised and approved by all, the Confession was sent to Luther." *Introductio*, p. 169. But Walch had never seen the Nurenberg "Protocol," which Dr. Krauth has ignored in some of its most important parts, particularly the "Postscript"—Had Walch seen the "Postscript," he would have seen that the Confession was not revised and approved by all until June 21st.

Francke (Dr. Krauth's 23,) after quoting the Preface-Extract, simply says: *Iterum ergo, ut videtur, missa est* being understood after the *ergo*. *Libri Symbolici*, p. XVIII. He too has overlooked or ignored important parts of the "Protocol," and especially the "Postscript." Thus it turns out that the whole weight of Dr. Krauth's learned authorities (17 and 23 excepted, in the way we have shown) is against Dr. Krauth's theory.

10. Of the many learned men, who during a period of two hundred years after 1530, wrote histories of, and commentaries on, the Augsburg Confession,—Chancellor Brück, Chytraeus (German 1576, Latin 1578.) Coelestin 1577. Selneccer 1583, Kirchner, Selneccer and Chemnitz 1584, Hutter 1602, Mentzen 1613, John Müller 1630, Carpzov 1665, Calov 1688, J. J. Müller 1705, Hoffmann 1727, Funcke 1730, Cyprian 1730, Salig 1730—of these and many others we have examined on the subject, not one holds a theory of a *third* sending, or has so interpreted Melanchthon's Preface, or has given, so far as we can discover, any intimation that he even imagined that the Confession had been sent to Luther three times before its delivery. From Walch, 1732, to the present day we know of no German scholar (Francke's "videtur" excepted) who has followed Walch in his interpretation of Melanchthon's Preface, and has declared for a *third* sending.

lie in the letter of it, and that even after it had been signed,* it was not regarded as a fixed law, or as an unalterable statement of the Lutheran doctrine. Its authority with its subscribers lay in the supposition and belief that its "doctrine does not differ from the Scriptures, nor from the Catholic Church, nor from the Roman Church in so far as it is known from writers."

LUTHER NOT CONSULTED ABOUT THE CONFESSION FROM MAY
22ND UNTIL AFTER JUNE 25TH.

Strange as it may appear, it is nevertheless a fact that there is not known to exist a single syllable of evidence that Luther was consulted about the preparation of the Confession after May 22nd. From that date to June 25th he was written to, June 1st by the Elector, June 12th and 13th by Jonas, June 13th by Melanchthon, June 18th by Jonas, June 19th by Melanchthon. But not one of the letters informs him of the work that is being done on the Confession, or inquires for his opinion, or asks his advice about the "Apology" or the Confession that is the subject of so much care and anxiety at Augsburg. Of the letters, eighteen in number, written by Luther to his friends at Augsburg, from April 23d to June 29th, only one, that of May 15th to the Elector, makes any reference to the Confession. All the rest are as silent on the subject as though no such thing as an "Apology," or a Confession, had ever existed. Hence barring the marginal notes referred to in the *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, October, 1899, p. 523, n., it is impossible to show that Luther exerted any influence on, or contributed anything to, the composition of the Confession after April 22nd; and equally impossible is it to show that he expressed any opinion, barring the letter of May 15th to the Elector, on the "Apology" or Confession, until June 29th, that is, four days after it had been delivered to the Emperor. What is perhaps the most remarkable of all is the

*It is agreed among scholars that the Confession was signed at the meeting of the Princes *et al.* June 23rd. See Weber *Kritische Geschichte*, I., p. 320; Francke, *Libri Symb.* p. XIX.; Plitt, I., 534; Krauth, *A Chronicle of the A. C.*, p. 46. We know that it was "signed" already when the Princes sought to have it read, June 24th. See C. R. II., 128; Jonas's *Briefwechsel*, I., p. 163.

fact that Luther never wrote a line to Melanchthon about the "Apology," until after June 25th, though Melanchthon three times, May 4th, 11th, 22nd, gave Luther information about the "Apology," and at least furnished Luther the opportunity to write him about it.

These are facts that cannot be called in question. Some learned men have tried to explain them, or to explain them away. But they cannot be explained away, and no satisfactory explanation of them has fallen under the eye of the present writer. They are given here as a part of the history of the Augsburg Confession. They show to a demonstration that Luther's influence at Augsburg from May 2nd to June 25th was far less than some persons have supposed and declared. Within this period he was not the inspirer and director of the movements at Augsburg. For "three full weeks" he was left in total ignorance of what was going on there. For more than four weeks he was not informed of the daily changes made in the "Apology."

And yet it is not intended by this recital of facts to affirm, or even to intimate, that Luther exerted no influence at Augsburg within the dates last written. He prayed for his friends at Augsburg, and exhorted them, especially the Elector and Melanchthon to steadfastness. But this he did much more *after* June 25th than before that time, as the letters before us clearly show.* It was not until he had read the copy of the Confession† sent him by Melanchthon, June 26th, and was asked what further concessions were to be made, and perceived that the leading Protestants were intent upon reconciliation with the enemy, that he threw himself into the balance and measurably resumed the old dictatorship which many a time had brought inspiration to the hearts of his friends, and had sent terror to the heart of the foe. But even then he could write to Melanchthon: "I am displeased because in your letters you write that in this matter you have followed my authority. I will neither be, nor be called, your authority in this matter."‡

*DeWette, IV. 53, 49, 62, 63, 65, 82, 83, 84, 88, 89, 91 *et passim.*

†C. R. II., 141.

‡DeWette, IV. 53.

Perhaps no one has stated the whole case more in accordance with the facts than the learned and conservative Plitt. He says: "It would be a mistake to suppose that Luther from Coburg directed affairs on the evangelical side at Augsburg. From his fortress he followed all the proceedings there with the closest attention. He had them continually before him. He lived through them and fought through them inwardly, and especially did he carry them on his most faithful, praying heart. As a matter of fact he exerted a great influence on the course of events. But he did not purposely and intentionally do so. On the contrary, so far as was in him, he purposely refrained from such influencing, and repeatedly expressed himself to the contrary, when something of the kind was expected of him at Augsburg. *The cause is not mine*, he said. Only in the beginning of his sojourn at Coburg, in his *Admonition to the Clergy Assembled at Augsburg*,* did he undertake, in his own strong and free way, to warn them for *their own sake*, not to aim the bow too high, inasmuch as Münzer's spirit is not yet dead, but finally to propose peace, as he summoned them to make the doctrine of the gospel free. And then when his friends at Augsburg showed signs of weakening, and the essential thing seemed to be in peril, even with greater vehemence did he cast his sword into the scale. In other matters he quietly held himself aloof, and let things come to him, in order to express himself about them occasionally, as it seemed good to him."†

This we regard as an intelligent, fair and impartial statement of the facts touching the question of Luther's influence on the

*This *Admonition* was addressed to the *Catholic*, not to the *Lutheran*, Clergy at Augsburg. Erlangen Edition of Luther's Works, 24:356. It has been called "Luther's Augsburg Confession." It contains a wonderful commingling of mildness and severity. It is a lifelike picture of the real Luther, who calls it *meam invectivam contra Ecclesiasticos*, De Wette, IV., 15. It was known at Augsburg by June 7th. *Strassburg Politische Correspondenz*, p. 451. Jonas writes to Luther: "Your truly prophetic book is read and applauded by all the pious, gods and men, while Satan rages and gnashes his teeth," *Briefwechsel* I., 153. Its sale at Augsburg was forbidden by command of the Emperor. C. R., II., 91.

†Dr. Martin Luther's Leben, pp. 363-4.

Diet of Augsburg. It will be observed that the learned author does not even mention the Augsburg Confession as coming within the scope of that influence. He also declares that it is a mistake to suppose that Luther directed affairs at Augsburg.

If the question be asked, Why did not Luther take a lively interest in the composition of the Confession, we may suggest the following reasons: 1. He was only once *officially* consulted about the Confession, May 11th. 2. He was very much occupied with the translation of the Prophets, and of Aesop, and with other literary work. Of his literary labors he makes frequent mention in his correspondence.* 3. He did not expect that anything of importance would be accomplished at or by the Diet.†

THE PUBLIC READING OF THE CONFESSION.

It will add much to the interest and value of this paper to have an account of the public reading of the Confession from the pens of those who were present and witnessed the same.

The Elector of Saxony, writing to Luther, June 25th, evidently before 3 o'clock, P. M., says: "On the day of John the Baptist (June 24th) we with our allies, presented ourselves before the Emperor, the King of Bohemia, the Electors and Estates, at a public meeting, and offered, in accordance with the Imperial Command, to present our Articles in Latin and German, to read publicly and deliver the German. Though we several times humbly begged to read them publicly, yet we did not succeed; for the King and the opposing party resolutely opposed it. But we have now the assurance that the Emperor will hear the Articles to-day in his Palace,—so arranged that not many persons can be present."‡

*DeWette, IV. 10, 15, 43, 44, 51.

†*Kirchengeschichtliche Studien*, p. 263.

‡German in Schirrmacher, 87-9 and in Chytraeus, p. 45b; Latin in Coel-estin, I., 140. Valdesius in his History of the Diet of Augsburg (found in Cyprian, Beylagen, VII), says the Lutheran Princes wanted their Confession read publicly for the purpose of catching the popular ear. No doubt each party correctly interpreted the motive of the other.

The Nurenberg legates, writing to their Senate, June 26th, say: "Yesterday, Saturday, at 3 o'clock, P. M., the Confession of faith, as it was when we last wrote you, subscribed by the Elector, the other Princes, and in your name and in that of Reutlingen, was delivered, in Latin and German, to the Emperor in the presence of the King, the Electors, Princes and Estates, assembled in the Palace. It was first read in German before their Majesties, the Electors, Princes and Estates, by the Saxon Chancellor, Dr. Christian (Beyer), publicly and distinctly, so that all present could easily hear it. Then the Emperor, after a conference with the other Electors and Princes, announced, through Duke Frederick, to the Elector of Saxony and his allies, that his Majesty had heard the Confession. But inasmuch as the matter was somewhat lengthy, and also highly important, necessity was laid on his Majesty to consider and to counsel well over the matter,—that he would do this and would demean himself in the matter as becomes a gracious Christian Emperor, and when he shall have made up his mind on the subject, he will again summon the Elector and the Princes. For this answer and gracious hearing the Elector, Princes and allies, returned their hearty thanks to the Emperor, the King, the Electors, Princes and Estates, with the assurance that they had acted in all loyalty and friendliness; also that if his Majesty should summon them again, they would willingly appear, and not only in regard to this matter, but in regard to all of the matters of the Diet summoned by his Majesty, they would perform their duty.

"Then the Emperor, as it has since been reported to us, spoke with the Electors and Princes privately, and requested them to retain the Confession by them, and not to allow it to be printed. This they promised to do. His Majesty did not conduct himself ingraciously during this procedure. We have also heard more than one say that no objection could be found with such a confession, and some of the Electors and Princes regard it as moderate."*

We find another account of the reading of the Confession in Schirrmacher's *Briefe und Acten*, pp. 89–90. It may, or it may

*C. R. II., 142–3.

not, have been written by an eye-witness. It has the value of an original document, and as such it is here presented:

"On Saturday after John the Baptist's day, the Elector of Saxony, Duke John, Margrave George of Brandenburg, Duke John Frederick of Saxony, Duke Ernest of Brunswick and Lüneburg, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, Duke Francis of Brunswick and Lüneburg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, and the two cities Nurenberg and Reutlingen, had the CONFESsION of their faith and of the entire Christian doctrine that is preached in their principalities, lands and cities, publicly read in German, article by article, with Christian joyous courage and heart, and that not only in the presence of all the Electors, Princes, Estates, Bishops, Counsellors, that were present, but also before the Roman Emperor himself and his brother, King Ferdinand.

"It was read by the Saxon Chancellor, Dr. Christian, so loud and distinctly that it was heard not only in the hall, but also in the yard below, that is, in the Bishop of Augsburg's court, where the Emperor's lodgings are.

"The Confession had been composed in German and Latin, but on account of the shortness of the time it was read only in German. The Estates also promised a fuller explanation, if anything should be found lacking in the Confession, and they declared that they do not decline the council that has been so long promised and ordered."*

The room in which the reading took place was the chapel of the Augsburg episcopal palace. It had capacity for about two hundred persons. At one end on a raised platform sat Charles V., richly clad, under a splendid canopy. On the right he was flanked by the Elector of Saxony followed by a long line of princes. On the left sat King Ferdinand under a small canopy, flanked by the Electors of Mayence and Cologne, the empty chair of Treves, by archbishops and bishops. In the midst of these sat Dr. John Eck. Toward the rear sat the legates of the cities and the civil counsellors. In the middle of the room sat the two imperial secretaries. The supreme moment came at four o'clock when the Princes made as though they would rise

*See an almost verbally identical account in Spalatin's *Annales*, p. 134-5.

and stand during the reading of their Confession; but the Emperor bade them sit down. Then Drs. Brück and Beyer came forward in front of the Emperor, the former holding in his hand a Latin copy of the Confession, and the latter a German copy. The Emperor asked that the Latin copy be read, but the Elector interposed and said: "We are on German soil. Therefore I hope His Majesty will also permit the German language." After a short address by Dr. Brück in the name of the Protestant Princes and Estates, the Confession was read by Dr. Beyer in the German language. The reading lasted two hours. The Emperor, the King, Princes, Bishops, and others, listened with the closest attention, though the Emperor is said to have nodded for a while. When Dr. Beyer read from the Confession that four hundred years before that time the Pope had prohibited marriage to the German priests, and that the Archbishop of Mayence had enforced the prohibition, the King asked the Archbishop of Mayence if that was true.*

After the reading Dr. Brück took both copies and was about to deliver them to Alexander Schweiss, the Imperial Secretary, to be passed to the Elector of Mayence, the Imperial Chancellor. But the Emperor reached out his hand and took both copies.† The German copy he gave to the Elector of Mayence. The Latin he retained. Both copies were originals, and both have perished; at least it is not known that either is in existence. The Latin was taken to Brussels, and thence may have been carried to Spain. The German copy is thought to have been taken to the Council of Trent, and possibly thence to Rome; but the most diligent inquiry in the Imperial Archives in Spain, and in the Vatican Library at Rome, has failed to discover a trace of either of them.

It is thus the misfortune of the Lutheran Church not to have a true, diplomatic copy of the very Confession of faith that called her into existence and gave her her distinctive life.‡

*Coelestin, II., 189; Spalatin, *Annales*, p. 139.

†Spalatin, p. 139. Brück's *Geschichte*, p. 55.

‡"In the strictest sense we do not know the wording of the 'Augustana,' and the numerous copies from the time of the Diet, show that the differen-

The Emperor commanded his Secretary, Alexander Schweiss, to translate the Confession into French and Italian, and to see that not one word was omitted in the translations, but that the whole matter be correctly expressed. Cardinal Campeggius sent a copy of the Italian version to the Pope, Clement VII. The legates of the Kings of England, France and Portugal, and the representatives of other foreign rulers, had the Confession translated into their respective languages, and sent to their Principals. "Thus it happened," says J. J. Müller, "that this Confession of faith, almost like lightning, spread in a moment from the East to the West, and was espoused, not only by individuals, but by whole nations,—yea, it shall stand not only before the Pope, but before the Devil, and before the gates of hell to the last day."*

ARTICLE IV.

FACING THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

BY REV. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

We acknowledge our indebtedness for the suggestive and momentous thought of this brief paper to the Rev. Dr. James M. King, General Secretary of the National League for the Protection of American Institutions. As we face the Twentieth Century, Doctor King, in this fresh and readable volume of 640 pages, looks at our National peril chiefly from the menace to all civil and religious freedom, coming down through the centuries, with the traditional *semper eadem* assumption of the Papal Hierarchy, laying claim to temporal, spiritual and universal dominion. That is the right interpretation of the arrogated vicarship of Christ by the Pontiff at Rome. This interesting volume is a wide and timely survey of our American Institutions and civilization, of the perils which menace them and of the forces which may be depended upon to protect them. With the recesses in expression, though seldom in matters essential, are so many, that the hope of restoring an authentic text is very small." Prof. Kolde, *Augsburgische Konfession*, p. 10.

**Historie von der Evang. Staende, etc.*, p. 588; Coelestin, II., 191b.

ligious conscience of our Roman Catholic brethren we have no controversy, nor responsibility, save to win them to the better way, and to lead them out of the darkness, amid which we doubt not many of them find Christ and pardon and peace and eternal life. God has in this historic Church a people who obey and love and serve him, but who do not yet appear to have come into the fulness of light and life as we have it in Christ Jesus. It is with the politico-religious aspects of the Hierarchy that we have to do, as citizens of this Christian Republic. Doctor King emphasizes our National peril. The enlightened, patriotic and Christian people of the Nation are competent to solve righteously this and all other problems confronting us, as the years come and go. Nations, as well as individuals and families and churches, have their divinely appointed mission and destiny. The mission of free America appears to be to lead the family of nations, all of which are struggling for the freedom of truth wherewith Christ makes free, out into the fulness of freedom, which we enjoy.

Facing the Twentieth Century, we in America are solving that greatest of Christian problems—*the unity of believers*—for which our Lord prayed. In the great union organizations and works of the present day, believers are actualizing, as never in the history of the Church, the aphorism of the Reformers: In Essentials Unity; in Nonessentials liberty; in all things charity. As in nature so in grace, diversity in unity, and unity in diversity, is God's law, written everywhere. The struggle for uniformity, in the dogmatic statement of truth, in ritual or in polity, is unnatural, unscriptural, undesirable, unattainable and utopian.

With the rapidly increasing wealth of the nation, the *money problem*, in its relation to the Kingdom of God, is vital and is stirring the conscience of God's people. Gold and silver are wasted in untold millions, even among Christ's people, whilst we are giving only the crumbs to the work of the Lord. After a while we shall grow to a recognition of our Christian stewardship, and in this we will find the ultimate solution of this problem. Ye are not your own, and the gold and silver are the Lord's.

The *race problem* with its frictions and oppressions and tears

and blood; the *liquor problem*, costing us more than a billion of dollars annually, beside the terrible entailment of drunkenness and widowhood and orphanage; of pauperism and vice and crime, and insanity; the problem of the *modern city*, and how to govern it and deliver it from hydra-headed corruption, its rottenness and stench; these are among the problems that confront us as we face the twentieth century. With the rise, decline and decay of nations, from Egypt to Babylon, to Greece, to Rome, to Italy, to Spain, we may read everywhere on the crumbling ruins the confirmation of the divine word, *the nation and Kingdom that will not serve God shall perish*. As justice and righteousness are the foundation of our Republic, will it abide; it is always true, that righteousness exalteth the nation. Back of all these are other problems; atheism, materialism, and infidelity in its many forms, attack the very foundations of the faith in Christ in whom centre the world's hopes.

Dr. King, in his racy volume makes startling statements, and with the flash light of facts and of logic, uncovers an enemy, attacking with the persistency of Jesuit wisdom, the foundations of our American institutions. Whilst all who read his book, may not enter as fully as he into the alarm, which he sounds; yet there is call to thoughtful and prayerful vigilence, upon the part of all who love the Flag, and the principles of freedom and righteousness for which the flag stands. The representative religious press of the country gives unstinted commendation to Doctor King's book, the *Christian Advocate* calling it "an arsenal of weapons, an alarm bell, which ought to ring whenever by stealthy approach, or by sudden spring, the Jesuits and those whose work they do, are undermining civil liberty, delivering votes *en masse*, or disparaging, or antagonizing the public schools." Doctor Josiah Strong, author of "Our Country;" Hon. Charles K. Skinner, Sup't. of Public Schools, State of New York; Gen. Thomas J. Morgan, late U. S. Commissioner of Indian affairs; Doctor David Grigg, author of the "Makers of the American Republic," speak patriotically and heroically of our author and his book. The Roman Catholic press, of Boston and New York, we need hardly say, is unstinted in denuncia-

tion of the work of our author, advising the boycott of *McClure's Magazine*, because of its advertisement of the book. Doctor King says, "the boycott is everywhere essentially a Roman Catholic institution, and is extensively employed against merchants and others, who dare to advertise in papers, which fearlessly discuss facts concerning its aggression." He further says, "we are authentically informed, that many, if not most of the political daily papers in this country are under Roman censorship either by the power of political fear or by the presence on the editorial staff of some astute and watchful Roman Sentinel."

Within the limits of a brief paper, it is possible to give only a cursory glance at the statements of this very interesting and stirring volume. It certainly appeals strongly to the friends of truth, as it is in Jesus; to the eternally protesting Church; to the enemies of priestcraft and kingscraft; and to American citizens, native and adopted, who are jealous of the freedom and perpetuity of American institutions. Our Republic of freedom was born contemporaneously with our common Protestantism, in the reformation and regeneration of the 16th century. At Worms Luther stood for the world's freedom, an "Alpine Man," and the freedom thus achieved is to liberate man everywhere. Michelet, the French historian, himself a Roman Catholic, calls Luther the Liberator of Modern Thought. The rugged Carlyle designates Luther "as a mighty man, whose light was to flame as the beacon over long centuries, and epochs of the world. The whole world he added, was waiting for this man, a true great man, great in intellect, in courage, affection and integrity, a most loveable and precious man." The protest in the 16th century and the Declaration of American Independence in the 18th century are inseparably linked together in the unfolding of God's providence.

The danger of our Republic does not lie in the direction of so called Imperialism, differing as, equally honest and patriotic men may differ in regard to the expansion of National domain. The problems involved in this expansion will be wrought out, but not fully in one generation. Nations are born in a day, but it requires years and generations to work out their destiny.

But whilst we have an abiding faith in the patriotism and love of freedom instinct with American life, there is need for vigilance as we stand in the presence of a Hierarchy, whose insidious, wily and persistent purposes are traditional, and whose boast through the centuries, in her *Semper Eadem*, in dogma, in polity and in spirit, with a bloody record of 1200 years behind us, yet Rome's claim to supreme temporal, spiritual and universal dominion comes ringing down the centuries with alarming monotony. This arrogance we contest in the name of every American freeman and in the Name that is above every name; Jesus Christ alone is king, and he has no vicar. In Jesus Christ every believer is free, forever free, as his own conscience interprets his American and Christian birthright. Much as we love peace and cultivate Christian fraternity with all men, we dare not sleep in the presence of this peril. The American Constitution says, there shall be no establishment of religion and it guarantees liberty of speech and of the press to all law-abiding citizens. The Pope of Rome says: "It is the liberty of perdition."

Doctor King quotes freely from leaders of thought, men who cannot be charged with religious bigotry. Let us hear some of them, *Macaulay* says: "The polity of the Church of Rome is the very masterpiece of human wisdom. * * * The experience of 1200 years, and the ingenuity of patient care of 40 generations of statesmen, have improved that polity to such perfection, that among the contrivances which have been devised for deceiving and controlling mankind, it occupies the highest place."

Froude says: "So much only can be foretold with certainty, that if the Catholic Church anywhere recovers her ascendancy, she will again exhibit the detestable features, which have invariably attended her supremacy. Her rule will be found once more incompatible either with justice or intellectual growth, and our children will be forced to recover by some fresh struggle, the ground which our forefathers conquered for us, and which we by our pusillanimity surrendered."

Mr. Gladstone says: "The Pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents, as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere. * * * Against such definition of his own power there is no appeal to reason, that is rationalism; nor to Scripture, that is heresy; nor to history, that is private judgment." He adds: "No one can become her convert without renouncing his moral and mental freedom, and placing his civil loyalty and duty at the mercy of another."

Lord Palmerston says: "All history tells us that whenever the Romish priesthood has gained the predominance, then the utmost amount of intolerance is invariably the practice. In countries where they are in the minority, they instantly demand not only toleration, but equality; but in countries where they predominate they allow neither toleration nor equality."

Victor Hugo says: "Ah! We know You! We know the clerical party; it is an old party, this it is, which has found for the truth those two marvelous supporters, ignorance and error. This it is, which forbids to science and genius the going beyond the missel, and which wishes to cloister thought in dogmas. Every step which the intelligence of Europe has taken has been in spite of it. Its history is written in the history of human progress, but is written on the back side of the leaf. It is opposed to all." * * * "There is a book, a book which is from one end to the other an emanation from above; a book, which contains all human wisdom, illuminated by all divine wisdom, well, your censure has reached even that unheard-of-thing. Popes have proscribed the Bible! How astonishing to wise spirits! How overpowering to simple hearts! to see the finger of Rome placed upon the Book of God. Now, you claim the liberty of teaching. Stop, let us see your pupils, let us see those you have produced. What have you done for Italy! for Spain! The one in ashes the other in ruin."

Had Victor Hugo written to-day he would have given added emphasis to his powerful arraignment by adding Cuba and Porto Rico and the Philippines. What an object lesson, and the American people of all people should study it.

Looking backward, Doctor King tells us how the Hierarchy lays its hand upon the ballot box, and thwarts the will of the American people, who are Protestant in very large majority. We hear nothing of the Methodist, or Baptist, or Presbyterian, or Lutheran vote, and yet the vote of these bodies severally is about equal to the Roman Catholic vote. Only about one-eighth of our people are subjects of the Pope, and the loss to that Church, under the influence of freedom is large and constant. The Protestant vote is intelligent and independent and divided; and is not swayed by church influences. Our author tells how the Republican national platform of St. Louis was changed by a telegram from Archbishop Ireland and he gives a copy of the telegram. He also reminds us that the Chairman of the Democratic and Republican National Committees that year, were both Roman Catholic. He further says, the 16th amendment to protect public money from sectarian inroads, was defeated by Romanists in 1876; that an organized Roman Catholic lobby is maintained in this city, to secure appropriations and to influence legislation; that an undue proportion of Roman Catholics are kept in federal, state and municipal offices; that school books and cyclopedias are changed, to pervert general and American history; and how the Church has been and is opposed to our public school system. He substantiates his statements by facts and by sound reason; the whole enforced by undoubted loyalty to truth and right, as also to our free Republic, and to the coming kingdom of our Lord.

In closing this brief paper we use a paragraph from one of Doctor King's reviewers. The *Northern Christian Advocate* says:

"The author is no pessimist. He does not despair of the Republic. He believes confidently that a sovereign and sure remedy, more than equal to the malignant disease seeking to fasten itself on the giant limbs and viscera of the Nation, may be found in the benign and saving forces and powers lodged in the breasts of the American people. These he sets forth; and eloquently and solemnly invokes the co-operation of patriotic societies, all Christian churches, every individual Christian and every intelligent patriotic citizen, to the end—already so well

advanced—of forever safeguarding the bulwarks of our civil and religious liberty, by bolting and riveting their under-lying principles into the organic law of each State, and by writing the proposed XVI. Amendment into the Constitution of the United States."

This politico-ecclesiastical menace to our Republic is certainly of great moment, propably *the* one great peril, confronting us as we look into the new century. But with seven-eighths of our people non-Roman Catholics, the most intelligent and loyal citizens; with Rome herself divided and the pulsations of freedom beating strongly in the American party of that great Church, we need but arouse ourselves to patriotic duty and vigilance. Whilst we not only tolerate, but absolutely guarantee to every man absolute freedom of conscience, be he Jew or Gentile, Protestant, Roman Catholic or Pagan, this Republic is essentially and first of all, Christian, and then Protestant. The Americanism, which the non-progressive mediaeval friends of the Hierarchy deplore, and which they would destroy, is but the instinctive pulsation of the soul everywhere panting and struggling for the freedom which truth brings, and which, through the liberated Gospel, is yet to make the world free from all kingcraft and priestcraft, making every believer in Christ Jesus a king and a priest unto God forever and ever. Long live the Republic. God and truth are marching on.

ARTICLE V.

INFANT MEMBERSHIP.

BY REV. W. H. DOLBEER, A. M.

The Lutheran Church believes and teaches that the commission given to the Apostles "to disciple all nations" is not only a command, but also a promise to the Christian and to his children. She holds, that, as to the natural, so to the spiritual descendants of Abraham, God has made an abiding covenant and promise in the words, "For the promise is unto you, and to your children."

The commission in Matt. 28 : 19, 20, reads: "Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Now the thing commanded is, "make disciples;" the process or means used is, "baptizing" and "teaching."

We therefore believe, that, by virtue of the commission and the promise, our children have a right to Christian baptism, and by that baptism they receive the seal of a covenant relation to God. That covenant relation is membership in his kingdom or Church.

It will be seen at a glance that the doctrines, "Infant Baptism" and "Infant Membership," are very closely allied. It is difficult to discuss the latter without drifting into a discussion of the former. Let us try to avoid this. We desire, however, to emphasize the fact that with the large majority, yes, nearly the whole of all Christendom, we believe in Infant Baptism. We have examined the arguments *pro* and *con*, and are sure that we have just grounds, Biblical and historical, for the practice of such baptism. We have sought to act intelligently in the practice of this rite, and baptize our children, not, as is sometimes intimated, because we are ignorant, but because of intelligent examination of the sources of knowledge upon this subject.

Baptism is that sacrament which was ordained as the initiatory rite inducting into the covenant relationship which constitutes membership in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is the sign and seal of that covenant relationship. There is no question in our minds that the children of believers are proper subjects for such membership, and much in the word of God warrants our faith.

We have to deal simply with the fact and what that fact involves.

In the first place, then, let us examine into the source of this fact, the origin of infant church membership.

It is an accepted fact in the Lutheran Church that the "Word of God" is the one complete and final authority on any matter which it defines. To us, an appeal to any thing as authority which differs from that holy word—as for instance the reason—carries no weight. The Augsburg Confession derives all its importance from the fact that it is an adopted statement of a wonderfully unique conception of the meaning and scope of the Scriptures.

The word established infant membership. Some one may say, "Yes, we know it did in the Jewish Church." We are glad so much is granted. Now let us find what relation exists between the Jewish Church and the Christian Church. There are those who regard them as wholly distinct. The Scriptures themselves are the best authority on the question.

While it is conceded by all that infant membership was an obligatory institution in the Jewish Church, there are those who say that that Church with all that pertained thereto has passed away, and therefore its laws and practices can have no bearing upon the subject. They say, and truly, that we are not under the Law but under the Gospel. And they appeal, in support of their position, to such passages as Heb. 8th, 9th and 10th chapters. For instance, Heb. 8:13, says: "In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." The writer of Hebrews, however, in these chapters fully defines just what he means by this covenant which is waxing old, and vanishing

away. It is the law with all the Tabernacle ceremonies and priestly offices. He demonstrates that these pass away by merging every principle into Christianity. In passing from Judaism to Christianity the Church lost nothing but the formal types. The types have vanished because they were types, and that which they foreshadowed has come. Every item of legal service was prophetic of Christ and his Church. We grant that the law is done away by and in Christ. But there is something in the Christian Church to take the place of everything in the law. Every type in the law finds a fulfillment in the gospel, and the very principle of all truth and practice under the law passes on into the Church under the gospel. So that infant membership does not necessarily pass away with the law.

We, however, are not dependent upon the law for infant church membership. It was made obligatory under the law, but was not instituted by the law, for it preceded that almost half a thousand years. It was instituted when God first chose a separate family to be his own peculiar people, his Church, and upon the identical basis of membership—as required in the Christian Church, *i. e.*, righteousness through faith. God imputed the righteousness to Abraham because of his faith, and thereupon made an everlasting covenant with him and his descendants. The rite inducting into that covenant was circumcision, the covenant relation was church membership, and infants were admitted into that covenant formally at eight days of age. This covenant is called the “covenant of promise,” as in it God made a great promise to Abraham, and sealed that promise to him and to his children by circumcision. When God promised Abram that his descendants should be as numerous as the stars it is said in Gen. 15 : 6: “And he believed the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness.”

In the 17th chapter of Gen., we are told that God renewed his promise to Abram, changing his name to Abraham. At the same time God repeatedly called this a covenant, an everlasting covenant, saying, “And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy

seed after thee." (God had made the covenant, now he says, "I will establish." When did God establish that covenant? The question will be answered later.) Then follows the institution of circumcision, Gen. 17:9-13. "And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised. * * * And it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." Concerning this, Paul in Rom. 4:11-13, says: "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith which he had being yet uncircumcised that he might be the father of all them that believe though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also; and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised. For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith." This shows that in the passing of the law the Abrahamic covenant was not affected. And while the form of the seal and token of that covenant changed with the advent of the Christian Church, the reason for the sealing still remains exactly the same, *i. e.*, righteousness through faith. On this ground the covenant was sealed then to infant children of believers, and likewise is it sealed to them now.

But the most positive and explicit declaration of this truth is found in Paul's epistle to the Galatians, 3:6, to close of chapter. This passage very plainly shows that the complete intent of the Abrahamic covenant is accomplished in Christ. Paul argues that the law coming in four hundred and thirty years

after, could not disannul that covenant. Perhaps some Galatians taught, as do some people to-day, that the whole Old Testament had become of no effect. But Paul shows otherwise, and in so doing explains the relation existing between the Abrahamic covenant, the law and Christianity. The Abrahamic covenant and the Christian covenant he construes to be one and the same, except that the latter is the completeness, the fulness of that covenant of promise. Not the fulfillment as with the law, but fulness of it. He demonstrates that such was the design of that first covenant. And he answers the question as to how and when God established the covenant which he had made with Abraham, saying: "That covenant was confirmed before in Christ." And again: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." To the infants of the families of Abraham's seed belonged the right of the seal and token of the covenant. So the apostle regarded the Christian as an heir under or according to the promise made to Abraham in the 17th chapter of Genesis. Christ is the one great seed or descendant confirming the covenant made to Abraham, Gal. 3:16, 17, confirming it to the followers of Jesus Christ. It is by this means that the blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith, Verse 14. And in the midst of the concluding verses of the chapter, where the apostle has so plainly defined the relation of Christianity to that covenant which instituted infant membership, he say: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." But why this brief reference to baptism in the midst of an argument showing the unity of the Abrahamic and Christian covenants? Because baptism sustains the same relation to the Christian annunciation of that covenant that circumcision did to the Abrahamic annunciation of the same covenant. The form of the covenant is one, namely, of promise. The end is one, namely, imputed righteousness. The condition is the same, namely, faith. The subjects are the same, namely, the cove-

nanted people of God, the Church. The form of the seal and token alone has changed from the type of the blood to the type of the spiritual working of the gospel; from that which could apply only to the male, to the needs of the gospel which knows neither male nor female; from circumcision to baptism. And the stage of the covenant has advanced from the promise to the consummation of the promise. God has, in Christ Jesus, established his covenant made with Abraham. By so doing he has not limited its scope to a narrower range, and taken its sign from a large class of those to whom it was originally given; but rather has he confirmed it to them.

No doubt the apostle is correct in his view of the relation of the Abrahamic and Christian dispensations, for he wrote by inspiration. The Church of God through all this time is one, a unit. Look at Rom. 11:17-30, where the Church is compared to a tame olive tree, of which the Jews are the natural branches, some of them cut off because of unbelief, and Gentiles are wild olive branches graft into this same tame olive tree by faith. But the trunk of this tree is one and the same. The trunk bears the branches, not the branches the trunk. And in verse 27 the apostle shows us that he has in mind this same covenant.

In Eph. 2nd chapter the Gentiles are spoken of as being "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenant of promise." Now we who were thus strangers and foreigners to this people of the covenant "are brought nigh by the blood of Christ." Nigh to what? Why, to the covenant of faith, and to the believers therein. And we are made fellow-citizens in the commonwealth of the children of Abraham by faith, namely, the saints, the household of the children of God. As the Apostle says, "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom *all the building* fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord." Here again we see the people of the covenant, the kingdom of the saints, the house-

hold of believers, all the building on the one foundation, growing from the day of the Abrahamic promise, and still growing as the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ unto an holy temple in the Lord.

We might refer with profit to other passages, but these are sufficient. They assure us that there is a stability, perpetuity and unity in the Church of our Lord once established upon earth.

Now, as we have seen, infant membership was ordained under the Abrahamic covenant. That covenant finds its true scope and development with the advent of Christ and under the Christian dispensation. In all the writings of the New Testament there is not one word, jot or tittle, which can be properly construed into a repeal of the command given to Abraham in Gen. 17:12, ordaining infant membership. There is enough said to cause baptism to supersede circumcision, but nothing changing the age of discipleship. While Christ does not say, in so many words, that infants should be formally received into the Church, yet, if it had not been so intended, it would have been necessary emphatically and positively to repeal the already universal practice. Had he not wished infant membership to continue, as it naturally would and did, he would have countermanded the rite long before ordained, or would have instructed the apostles to do so. Silence here most certainly gives consent, and has the force of a commandment. This fact, taken in connection with this other fact that infant membership is in perfect accord with the spirit and letter of the New Testament, gives us an invincible basis for our faith.

The sign and seal of the covenant as to its form has changed, but not the covenant. The covenant has advanced a step, and so has the sign, but nowhere has anything pertaining thereto been repealed. By this advance the covenant has certainly not been restricted in its intent and operation. The handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, has been blotted out and taken out of the way. Col. 2. That is, the ceremonial law, that which is fulfilled in the cross, or nailed to the cross; but the spiritual work of Christ, the putting away

of sins he calls the circumcision of Christ: The baptismal renewing, which separates the Christian from a sinful life. Let us give his language, Col. 2:11, 12: "In whom also are ye circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raisen him from the dead." This shows conclusively the relation of the two forms of the token of the covenant. The same promise attends both, and it is to you and your children.

Now since, in addition to these things, we find that the apostles and the early Church disciplined infants by baptism as the Jews had done by circumcision, we have full assurance that God designed the continuation of infant membership in his Church. We have the best historic evidence of those times that the Church administered the seal of discipleship to the children of believers.

Justin Martyr, born about A. D. 89, and writing in defense of the Christians about A. D. 150, speaking of those, then members of the Church, says: "A part of them are sixty or seventy years old, who were made disciples to Christ from their infancy." That is, these had received the seal of the covenant, baptism, long before the time of the death of John the evangelist, while they were infants, and from that time on they were disciples of Christ.

Irenaeus, born about the year 97, a disciple of Polycarp, who in turn was a disciple of John, says: "Christ came to save all persons who by him are born unto God, infants and little ones, and children, and youth and elder persons." Now the expression, "Born unto God," was at that time used to denote discipleship and membership by baptism. Irenaeus is so explicit that there can be no doubt as to the ages of the classes mentioned. Infants and little ones and children were disciplined.

Origin, born A. D. 185, the most learned man of his time, and who has quoted so profusely from the New Testament that it might be restored almost or quite entire from his writings, in a controversy about original sin, said: "According to the usage

of the Church, baptism is given even to infants, when if there were nothing in infants which needed forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would not seem to be necessary." Again, he says: "Infants are baptized for the remission of sins, etc., etc." And again: "For this cause it was that the Church received an order from the apostles to give baptism to infants." This shows conclusively that it was the common practice at that day to discipline infants.

As to whether infants should or should not be disciplined to Christ by baptism was never made a question in the early Church. Tertullian advocated the delaying of baptism because he conceived that it washed away actual sins. He looked upon it as a laving act, not as a state of grace. He recommended even to adult believers and converts to delay their baptism, claiming that it should be put off till the day of death if possible. But he says: "If an infant is sickly or likely to die, baptize it." And his writings are conclusive as to the practice and prevalence of infant discipleship at the close of the second century and the early part of the third. He seemed to think people could be disciplined to Christ without the seal and sign of discipleship. He is quoted against the doctrine, but if quoted fully he simply proves its existence. He advocated an innovation upon the established practice of his day, but failed to bring any considerable number over to his position.

In the year 254 A. D., at a council consisting of sixty-six bishops, and presided over by the learned Cyprian, in response to the question as to whether the rite of baptism should be delayed until the eighth day, it was unanimously decided that it should not be so delayed, that "even infants newly born are not to be kept from baptism and the grace of God."

Much more might be adduced to show that during the first several centuries of the Christian Church infant discipling was prevalent. This much we feel warranted in saying, that during the times of the apostles and church fathers the Church universally brought the infants into the fold of the Church by baptizing them. If it had not been so, the attempt to introduce the practice at that time would have caused very bitter debate and

opposition, and would have left abundant evidence in the writings of the times. We might hear to this late day the reverberation of the conflict as we hear the sound of Luther's hammer ringing against the church door in Wittenberg. But there was no such conflict. The very silence of the writings of that early period in the Church, and the fact that this doctrine is seldom referred to except in support of arguments on other questions, proves its unquestioned existence. Those who claim infant membership was introduced later by a degenerate Church should at least have the delicacy to remember that they have no patent-right upon history. There are not wanting among us those who can make original research along this line, and we are fully persuaded that the apostles and their successors made disciples of infants, baptizing them. There has never been a time since the Abrahamic covenant was made that there was not infant membership in the Church, unless it was during the persecution at the time Moses was born, when Israelitish mothers had to hide their male children to save them. And perhaps even then the practice was not wholly obliterated. There may also be one or two other occasions when it was shamefully neglected, but not by all. And in all this long space of history there has never been a time when God did not acknowledge infant membership by imparting his grace to those so disciplined as well as to any others; and we believe his grace to them has been more abundant.

So much for the fact of infant membership.

Now out of this fact arise questions of great importance to the Church. Three propositions will cover the ground, though time forbids we should discuss them fully.

- 1st. The state of the infant disciple.
- 2nd. The rights and privileges of the child so disciplined.
- 3rd. The duties of the Church to the children within the fold.

1. The state of the infant disciple.

Objectively he is of the household of believers. Subjectively he is in a state of faith. Not faith as held by an adult believer, but the germ, the primary ground of such faith. The means of

grace are channels for communicating grace when they are used according to divine provision. It is reasonable, that as an infant of man is subject to natural law, so an infant of believers is a subject for grace, and by the use of this means of grace becomes a subject of the law of grace. The words of Paul in Titus 3:5, now have a deeper meaning: "But according to his mercy he saves us, by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." This Scripture, in view of the fact that the apostles taught the Church to continue infant membership, is significant. That system of theology which would restrict the operations of God's grace to mature years is wholly arbitrary. Infancy is not a state of negation, but of receptivity, and in a state of receptivity alone does the Holy Ghost operate in any heart. Because of this capacity for receiving blessing Jesus lays his hands on little children and prays. Mat. 19:13-15. And in Mark 10:15 he says: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." And in Mark 9:42: "And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea." Let us keep in mind that these children were little ones in their mother's arms, and the zealous disciples thought to rebuke the mothers for bringing them. Christ taught those disciples by this act that those children were susceptible of his blessing and grace, and it should not be denied them. And we therefore find Paul in 1 Cor. 7:14, saying: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the (*believing*) wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the (*believing*) husband; else were your children unclean; but now they are holy." "Unclean," is a state of pollution or sin unremoved by appointed means; "holy," is a state of consecration secured by the use of means and the acceptance of conditions which God has appointed. The terms, when referring to religious conditions are universally so used. The apostle makes a very positive distinction between children of unbelievers and believers, saying the children of Christian parents are holy. They are set apart, dedicated by appointed means for divine

purposes. Yet there are those who would have us believe that the children of believers and those of unbelievers are on identically the same ground and in the same state as to grace; that they are either all clean, or else all unclean. Baptism is, as circumcision was, the seal of the covenant of righteousness by faith. The baptized child is set apart by the appointed means of grace for this life of faith. Your children are not unclean, but holy.

This is not a conclusion of the reason, nor by the reason, but by and through revelation. Hence when we attempt to explain the "How" we are as much at a loss as when we try to explain the processes of any of the great mysteries, as that of "God manifest in the flesh," the operation of the Holy Spirit, or Christ's presence in the Supper. We accept this as true that the Holy Spirit, working faith in whomsoever he will, does work in the receptive soul of an infant set apart for Christ, such grace as is needful for that child, and the beginning of a future, broader, deeper, more mature faith in the disciple's after life. As the apostle concluded that the Jew had great advantage over the Gentile, and there was much profit in circumcision because to the Jew was committed the oracles of God, and advantage in every other way also, so we can justly conclude that there is much advantage and profit to the child of believing parents, which by virtue of its parentage has right to the household of faith, and has under this right received the seal which signifies "Holiness unto the Lord," "The righteousness of faith," "An heir of the promise."

2nd. The child so discipled has certain rights and privileges in the Church. It has, however, not the communicant rights of maturer years. We need not state here why this is so. The child is to be regarded as consecrated, dedicated, set apart in the household of God for a holy life, to be looked upon as the discipled child of the Lord Jesus. He is on the inside, not the outside. He is the subject of grace, not simply a subject for grace. He is not the child of the world and the devil, with a preponderance in favor of serving them; but he is clean, holy, of the household of faith and a child of God. As such he has

indisputable claims upon the Church, and a very definite place therein. He has been admitted into the nursery of the Church. He shares with other members its blessings and promises. He belongs to a great family which is named after Christ. We have a not inapt illustration in this: The infants in our homes are just as truly members of the family, subjects and citizens of the State as we elder ones; so the children in the Church are fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, sharing his manifold grace.

3rd. In turn the Church, and the parent in the Church, is in duty bound to so direct and nurse the religious life already begun in the child at its baptism that it may grow up with the full abiding blessing of that grace. We rejoice that there are lambs in the fold. A lamb of a week is not less a lamb than one of three months. It may not be as large. They, belonging to the great fold of the Master, and enclosed in the same enclosure, are to be fed. "Feed my lambs." Here a great responsibility rests upon the Church. Had it fully discharged its obligation here, probably the doctrine of infant membership would never have been called in question. The Church must learn to discharge its duty to the lambs. But while there has been great neglect in this branch of church work, we must call attention to the fact that we never hear intelligent Lutherans say of the religious life of their children: "Oh we thought we would not say anything to them about it, but have decided to let them go till they are old enough to act in this matter for themselves." That is an expression every American pastor hears, but never among those who have conscientiously, prayerfully given their children to God by the right of baptism. We do wrong when we shift responsibility, and leave it for conversion to do what God intended we should do for the child. The Church needs more nursing fathers and nursing mothers.

This discipling of our infants is very useful in that it gives us assurance that the religious blessings we enjoy are guaranteed to our children. We are encouraged to take greater interest in their religious growth because God has given them a place in

the fold. We also have the advantage of keeping before the mind of the child the fact that he is already a child of God, a fact which we have found naturally pleasing to the young just as they are pleased to think of themselves as young Americans, and they learn the former sooner than the latter.

And so may our children in the fullest sense ever be the children of our Father which is in heaven: "Discipled unto the Lord from their infancy."

ARTICLE VI.

IN A JAPANESE HOME AT NEW YEAR.

BY REV. R. B. PEERY, PH. D.

Some years ago, on an invitation of a Japanese friend, who was at that time a student in Tokyo, I visited him in his home, and spent the New Year holidays there. My friend's father, Mr. Masuda, is a well-to-do merchant in the growing town of Takasaki, about three hours journey by rail from Tokyo. It is an interesting Christian household, and the opportunity of visiting in it was a welcome privilege, the pleasure of which was greatly enhanced by the fact that the visit came just at the New Year Festival—the most brilliant and popular of all Japanese festivals.

On the last day of the old year I accompanied my student friend to his home, and was duly presented to his father, mother, and sister—O Yone san. Mr. Masuda was a grave, kind-looking man past middle life; his wife was one of those sweet motherly old women who know how to make all around them comfortable; and O Yone san was a pretty girl of twenty summers, as sweet and bewitching as maidens are everywhere. As the friend of their son and brother, I was given a warm welcome, and made to feel quite at home.

Seeing the great pride my hosts felt in their son, and their joy of having him back with them, gave me a feeling of kinship to them. O Yone san was very proud of her big brother, who treated her with as much kindness and consideration as if she

had been his sweetheart. They formed a happy reunited family; and I was generously given a place in its sacred circle.

The preparations that had been diligently made for the festival so soon to begin were in evidence on every hand. The interior of the house was as clean and bright as a new dollar; while the picturesque little garden had been strewn with fresh white sand, and was cleanly swept and arranged in perfect order. The front gate was beautifully ornamented by a large arch of evergreen, over which hung an artistic straw cable, with an orange, a dried persimmon, a red lobster, and a bit of charcoal tied in the center. The cable is expected to keep the devils out for a whole year, and the articles attached to it are expected to bring long life and good fortune. O Yone san took me out to the kitchen and showed me a large supply of *mochi* she and the servants had prepared for the occasion. There it was in a great pile—small round cakes made of rice flour and beans, in various colors. Everybody is expected to eat *mochi* at this season, and it is said to give strength and courage for the battles of the new year.

In a little while supper was announced, and we all seated ourselves in a semi-circle on the soft mats, in the best room. Little tables about one foot square and six inches high were brought in and one was placed before each person; then nice lacquer bowls containing dainty bits of fish, eggs, and vegetables were placed on them; and a small tub of steaming hot rice was set down in front of us. A delicious evening meal it was! and we did it full justice. Noticing that O Yone san served the rice with her own hands, although there were plenty of servants in the house, I made bold to ask the reason, when Mr. Masuda replied, with a fine piece of sentiment: "I always have my daughter wait on me at meals, as the rice seems to taste better from her hands."

When supper was ended and our Lilliputian tables were all taken away my host said, thoughtfully: "Well, another year has gone, and we enter upon a new one to-morrow. It has been a hard year to most of us, but, by the blessing of God, I have been able to balance up my accounts and pay off all the

old debts; and now I can enter upon the new year with a clean record."

"Is it customary in your country to settle up old business and pay off all debts at the end of the year?" I asked. "Yes, indeed," he replied, "it is the great aim of every man to begin the new year unencumbered; and if he cannot do so there is no real joy in his heart on New Year Day, although he must put on a happy exterior, and receive the congratulations of his friends with a smiling face."

There is a very pretty Japanese custom of holding a watch-meeting on New Year's eve, bidding farewell to the old year and welcoming the new. The Christian people have adapted these meeting to their own need, and generally hold a beautiful little service just at midnight. My host said there was to be such a service in the chapel to which he belongs, and invited me to accompany the family to it. We set out at 11 P. M., and after a brisk walk in the cool night air, under a full moon, in due time we arrived at the chapel. It was an ordinary residence such as are frequently used for chapels here, with mats for a floor, paper partitions, and a roof of straw. Going inside, we found a party of twelve or fifteen men and women seated on the soft clean mats, with a little *hibachi*, or fire-box, in front of each one. The evangelist sat at the upper end of the room—a serious, thoughtful man of perhaps fifty years.

Promptly at 11.30 the service began by the singing of a suitable hymn; after which a short Scripture lesson was read and an earnest prayer offered. Then the evangelist, still sitting in familiar fashion among his flock, made a plain practical talk, reviewing the past year, and especially dwelling upon the manifold favors of God to the Church, the nation, and to most of us as individuals. He exhorted each one, very earnestly, to review his past life, confess his sins unto God, and begin the new year with a clear conscience and a deeper consecration to the Master. The occasion lent impressiveness to the talk, and all were visibly moved by it. The minute hand of the clock was drawing near to 12, and two or three short prayers were called for during the remaining minutes. The responses were prompt and sincere.

Suddenly the town clock began, slowly and deliberately, sounding the knell of the old year; and while its solemn tones were ringing in our ears we all, with united voice, breathed forth the Lord's Prayer, and the meeting was done. Then followed sincere congratulations and best wishes for the new year; after which the people quietly dispersed to their homes.

We were all up early next morning, and every one was dressed in his best clothes and wore his sweetest smile—for of all days in the year this must be the most cheerful and happy. Notwithstanding the season, the sun shone warm and bright, and it was a glorious day. Breakfast was dispatched in a hurry, and Mr. Masuda and his son, each taking a huge pile of cards, started off to pay their New Year calls—for every one must call on every one else in Japan on New Year's Day. O Yone san brought a fine screen and set it across the hall in front of the entrance; then she placed a rich mat before it, and put a silver card plate on the mat to receive the cards of those who should call.

Having no calls to make myself, I went out on the street to see what was going on on the outside. A bright and varied scene awaited me. The whole town was in holiday attire; and all was bustle, hubbub, and confusion. These people are generally slow and deliberate in their movements; but on this particular morning I found them as wide awake as Yankees, running here, there, and everywhere, as fast as their short legs would carry them. People were hurrying back and forth through the streets like bees in a hive; and all were gay and happy, faces that had been long and sour for months being now radiant with smiles. All the shops were closed—something which I have never seen on any other day of the year here,—and a national flag was waving from each house, the bright red suns looking very pretty in their setting of spotless white. Large arches of evergreen, or small living pine trees, ornamented each gate; and wildly happy little children, in gorgeous red robes, were playing around them, in high glee. It was a brilliant scene, such as can be witnessed nowhere else than in Japan, and even here only on New Year's morning.

After gazing on this lively street scene for a while, I returned to the house. I noticed that the card plate was already full to overflowing, and every few minutes some one rushed in, threw one more card on the pile, and hurried away. I was surprised to see little boys coming and leaving their cards, along with the men. In this ever-flowing stream of people there were no ladies; they must stay at home to receive guests for the first day, and make their calls later. Most of the callers simply left their cards, but occasionally an intimate friend of the family came inside and offered his congratulations in person. The usual formularies were as follows:

"This is a splendid New Year! I offer my congratulations."

"Thank you. It is a capital New Year!"

"Last year I received countless favors from you, and I pray that you will continue them throughout the new year also."

"No, positively, it is I who was helped by you. Please favor me with your august assistance this year, too."

Some very polite bows, and the caller is gone; only to be followed by others, who say the same things in turn. It used to be the custom for every one to come into the house and make a long call, but the habit of simply leaving the card has largely supplanted that in recent years.

Mr. Masuda and his son came in at a late dinner hour, looking as if they had been in a walking-race. And with good reason, for they had visited more than two hundred friends and acquaintances during the forenoon; but they took it all as a matter-of-course, and were smiling and happy over it.

For dinner we had a big feast in honor of the day, and the special dish was *mochi*. Each one ate as much as he could of it, thus laying up strength for use during the year. While the meal was in progress Mr. Masuda turned to me and said:

"We have all taken hold of another year now, and are one year older than we were yesterday. I believe you count differently in your country, but with us the New Year is everybody's birthday."

"How is that?" I asked. "We call a child one year old when

it is born, and two at the next New Year; then it takes one more year each New Year thereafter."

In the afternoon my friends again went out to complete their calls. The pile of cards at our own front door kept growing larger and larger, and this continued for two days. Finally the mania of calling seemed to exhaust itself, and the card plate was removed.

On the morning of the second day postal cards began to come in from friends at a distance, bearing congratulations by mail. These cards came from all parts of the Empire, wherever the family had friends. It is considered very impolite not to present congratulations at this season, and if it cannot be done in person custom requires that it be done through the mails.

I was much interested in the presents my hosts received on this occasion. The grocer, the butcher, the vegetable dealer, all brought substantial presents, and solicited the custom of the house for the new year. Several fine large fish were received from friends—fish being the regulation present of the season.

The holiday ended with a great feast, to which all friends of the family, and the clerks in Mr. Masuda's employ, were invited. After that the people gradually settled down to their former ways.

This New Year Festival, as I experienced it in the home of my friend, was almost romantic, and it was with a pang of regret that I saw it pass, and bade my kind entertainers farewell.

ARTICLE VII.

THE LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF INSPIRATION.

BY REV. ADAM STUMP, A. M.

Rich as our Symbols are in theological statement, they nowhere attempt a scientific definition of the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. The Augustana does not contain an article on the subject. None of the symbolical books presents any formal dicta on this theme. We do not find our doctrine on this lately-mooted question in ready-made credal propositions, but we must arrive at it by the inductive method of reasoning. Our fundamental Confession refers to it only incidentally. The nature of our proof must be circumstantial, but from that very fact all the stronger. What is taught by undesigned implication has greater force than the most studied and accurate verbal formulary.

Our present task therefore is to prove from the Lutheran symbols, and especially from the Augustana, that it is the faith of the Lutheran Church, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and that "the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but, holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 2 Tim. 3:16; 2 Peter 1:21.

As a working definition, we accept that of the Standard Dictionary, which *sub verbo* says: "Supernatural divine influence exerted upon the sacred teachers and writers by the Spirit of God by which divine authority was given to their writings."

For purposes of orthodoxy this broad statement is sufficient. To place ourselves on a par with the strictest inspirationists it would not be necessary to prove more. That definition contains all that is necessary, both to the theological and to the scientific side of the subject.

It will, of course, not be contended that the exact nature and manner of this divine inbreathing are necessary to the definition of inspiration. After the finest analysis, there will remain some-

thing that we cannot understand. However, for the clearness of thought, we will mention the various theories of inspiration that have been held and are still being advocated, by some. Certain of these theories contradict each other; others do not. All of them are only the teachings of men; yet are they not, on that account, to be treated with contempt.

First comes the mechanical theory. According to this the sacred writer simply was an automaton, a machine manipulated by the divine hand. The human element was entirely passive. The man did absolutely nothing, God everything. But Dr. Charles Hodge says: "The ancients, indeed, were accustomed to say, as some theologians also have said, that the sacred writers were as pens in the hands of the Spirit; or as harps, from which he drew what sounds he pleased. These representations were, however, intended simply to illustrate one point, namely, that the words uttered or recorded by inspired men were the words of God. The Church has never held what has been stigmatized as the mechanical theory of inspiration." (Sys. Theol., Vol. I., p. 156.)

Secondly, the verbal theory. According to this not only the concepts or ideas of the Scriptures, but even the very words were inspired. Although these words may not have been dictated by the Spirit, nevertheless since those who spoke or wrote them were at the moment under the divine afflatus, their language really became the language of God. Consequently the original manuscripts in the chirography of the prophets and apostles were, no doubt, *verbatim et literatim*, the words of God. But as we no longer possess these, our present copies of the holy oracles, though sufficiently reliable, are not any more perfectly accurate.

Thirdly, the moral theory. This is rather a too general term. By it is meant that the inspired writers were infallibly guided only with reference to moral and religious truths. While recording history or stating facts of science, as it was in their day, they were left to themselves, but when stating matters of divine revelation, they were guided by the omniscient mind. This is,

no doubt, partly true, but it is not the whole truth. As a theory it raised more questions than it answers. According to this notion, we would have only a partially inspired Bible.

Fourthly, the dynamical theory. On this subject Dr. Brown's notes are so clear that we will simply quote his words: "That the Holy Spirit employed men's faculties according to natural laws, and that the writers contributed somewhat to the divine record. * * * Those who admit only the divine must ignore what is found everywhere in the Sacred Word; viz., diversity of thought, style, manner of presenting the truth, and must advance an indefensible theory. And those who admit only the human have no guarantee against error. Both elements must be maintained, as both the divine and human are so clearly exhibited in the Bible itself."

In agreement with this setting forth of the theory, Dr. Valentine uses the following illustration: "Just as in nature in plant and tree, the principle of life, when annexed to certain portions of matter exhibits its vital energy in accordance with the conditions which that matter imposes, while it governs and directs, at the same time, the organism with which it is combined, so the Holy Spirit, animating and manifesting his power in and through the human instrument, displays his influence in harmony with the laws of mental action." (Lectures.)

Fifthly, we will yet glance at the plenary theory of inspiration. In modern times this terminology seems to be most universally adopted as best expressing the conviction of the Christian Church. Plenary is opposed to partial and conveys the idea that the *theopneustic* influence was extended to all the books and to every part of each book in the Bible. The inspiration is so complete that nothing is wanting. The human elements are not ignored. Yet the great book is not the product of the gradual development of the world's most gifted geniuses, but is an authentic record of a series of divine revelations to mankind.

Though this list does not exhaust the entire catalogue of modified theories, it presents the salient points of all. But we are now concerned, not for a theory, but about the fact of inspi-

ration. Has God spoken from heaven, and is the voice of prophecy his voice? Are the memoirs of the evangelist and the epistles of the apostles, and of their coadjutors, the messages of the Father to his children? But, above all, does the Lutheran Church so teach?

We will first gather the material and then state the argument, which is the same thing as first collecting the evidence and afterwards formulating it. We shall regard the Augsburg Confession as the only confessional authority in the discussion. The testimony of the other symbols and the teachings of our theologians we shall regard only in the light of corroborative and cumulative proof. Commentaries never can take the place of originals, and therefore they prove but little.

Previous to any positive declaration of our Church's faith in the divine inspiration of the Scriptures, there should be a presumption that such is the Lutheran view, from the fact that Lutherans give the Bible the highest place of authority. To them "the word of God, as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments," is "the only infallible rule of faith and practice." It should be taken for granted that a body of people, who thus exalt a book, must esteem it as being more than human.

This presumption, which a stranger could reasonably base upon the General Synod's introduction to our Confession, receives added force from the language of the "Preface to the Emperor Charles V," which the fathers read at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530: "We now offer in the matter of religion the Confession of our preachers and of ourselves, the doctrine of which derived from the Holy Scriptures and pure Word of God, and they have to this time set forth in our lands, dukedoms, domains, and cities, and taught in our churches." (Jacobs' Book of Concord, p. 34.)

As far as the General Synod is concerned, this question is once and for all time settled in Section 3 of Preliminary Principles, in Chapter I. of the Formula for Government and Discipline: "We believe that such a revelation God has given, at sundry times and in diverse manners, unto the fathers, and in

later days by his Divine Son, Jesus Christ, and his inspired servants; that this revelation is contained in the books known in Protestant Christendom as the Old and New Testaments." The same is true of the General Council, whose professors declare, at their investiture: "I believe that the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testaments are given by inspiration of God." (Conservative Reformation, p. 164.)

No doubt all the Lutheran constitutions of the world contain similar confessional principles. But this fact alone would not make an examination of our great *Magna Charta*, or general creed, unnecessary. The Augsburg Confession is at once the basal and universal document of Lutheran authority as to doctrine, and, if this fails us, our claim to faith in the inspiration of the Bible can not be made good. If the fountain is not pure, the stream that flows from it cannot be pure, or, if the foundation is not sure, the superstructure that is built upon it cannot stand. This is a fundamental axiom.

In the article (IV.), "Of Justification," the confessors include the third and fourth chapters of Romans as the ground of the doctrine and really as a part of the document. "Of the Ministerial Office" they say: "In order that we may obtain this faith, the ministry has been instituted for teaching the gospel and administering the sacraments. For through the instrumentality of the word and sacraments, the Holy Spirit is given, who, when and where it pleases God, works faith in those who hear the gospel." (Art. V.) "Concerning New Obedience" (VI.), they quote the text: "When ye shall have done all those things, say, we are unprofitable servants" (Luke 17: 10). In Article VII., they declare: "But the Church is the congregation of the saints, in which the gospel is correctly taught," and in Article VIII., "and on account of the appointment and command of Christ, both the word and sacraments are efficacious, even when administered by wicked men."

"Of Confession" (XI.) they aver that it is impossible to enumerate all our offences, and quote the Psalmist: "Who can understand his errors?" (Psa. 19: 12).

"Of the Cause of Sin" (XIX.), concerning the devil they quote

the words of Christ: "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own" (John 8:44). In the article of "Good Works" (XX.) the following passages are cited: "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (John 14:6). "Ye are saved by grace, through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God" (Eph. 2:8). "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God" (Rom. 5:1). In the conclusion of Part I. of the Confession they say: "This is about the sum of our doctrines, from which it is evident, that they contain nothing inconsistent with the Scriptures."

After in the same manner finding their footing on Scripture in Part II., on "Abuses Corrected," as numerous citations would show, their final sentence concerning the entire Confession exhibited in the following: "If anyone should find defects in it, we hold ourselves ready to furnish him with additional information, on the ground of the divine and holy Scriptures."

Having now the data in hand we are able to state our arguments in favor of the opinion that the confessional or credal manifesto of the Lutheran Church teaches the doctrine of inspiration as generally understood.

This is proven by the very absence of an article on this point. The enemies of the Reformers had left no stone unturned to bring accusations against them. They were charged with every imaginable heresy. They were condemned for ignoring or at least subordinating tradition, but no one was foolish enough to doubt their belief in the divine inspiration of the Holy Book. That was taken for granted, though likely unconsciously. The subject perhaps never came into mind. It was not necessary. Hence, though the word "inspiration" does not occur, in its technical sense, except as a quotation from Scripture, in any of our symbols, its very absence is proof and not disproof, that the doctrine of inspiration forms the background, the very *sine qua non*, of the Augsburg Confession. Its silence is more eloquent than words could possibly be. The position of the Apostles' Creed, under similar circumstances, is not any more unquestionable. As is evident from the specimens given in this paper, the Reformers indulged in many direct quotations from the Bible; but its general language is also so thoroughly sur-

charged with biblical thought, that its very ambient atmosphere is like an emanation from the sacred oracles. It is full of the electrical power of the living word, and it is so because the men who wrote it firmly believed that the author of that word was the omniscient and infinite God. Take out of the Confession its biblical wheat, and scarcely a handful of straw remains.

Another significant proof that such was the conviction of the Reformers at Augsburg, is their repeated renunciation of the Anabaptists. Though this violent and anarchistic sect, which formed the extreme left of the Protestant army, did not reject God's written word, since they burnt all their books except the Bible, they nevertheless claimed an inner inspiration, which in their mind superseded that of the Scriptures. They placed their subjective spirituality above that of the Testaments. They judged the Bible by their own inner light. Their criterion was not the inspired word, but their own inspired souls. They were radical mystics. As will be seen at a glance, their position was the very opposite of the Lutherans. Hence in Article V. we find this vigorous rejection: "They condemn the Anabaptists and others, who suppose that the Holy Spirit is given to men by their own preparations and works, without the external word." Naturally there would have been a great temptation on the part of the reformers to retain these fanatical co-workers. They out-Luthered the Lutherans themselves in their opposition to Rome. They seemed to have the logic of the situation. But the conservative confessors could not countenance anyone who trifled with the canonical Scriptures. Hence by renouncing the Anabaptists, they placed themselves on record upon the written word of God as the only authority in religion, and as the only norm of spiritual experience. How could they do so, unless they had been persuaded that the book had been, in some way, authenticated from on high; that it bore the marks of divine composition?

We noticed that the last sentence of the Augsburg Confession calls the Bible "the divine and Holy Scriptures." This reverent expression is not solitary. All through the document the language applied to the book is adorable enough to be applied to

its ineffable Author himself. Now those men were not using the verbiage of medieval diplomacy to hide their meaning, but the plainest terms to express it. They were no word-jugglers. When they employed the term "divine," they did not wish to impart to it a flippant secondary sense. They did not mean to say, as the most inconoclastic higher critic might do, that the Bible is the finest specimen of literature in existence; but that it is a supernatural scroll of heavenly truth, a literary miracle, and not a wonder-work of mere human genius. No scholar or historian ever has interpreted this product of their hearts and brains otherwise. He who runs may read between the lines that they believed in the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures as a fact.

This position is greatly strengthened by the collateral evidence which can be collected from the other writings of Melanchthon and the books of Luther. It is well-known, and undisputed, that the former composed and the latter indorsed the Augsburg Confession. Luther more than metaphorically looked over his friend Philip's shoulder while he was writing the historic instrument. If therefore we can discover, elsewhere, their views on the Bible, we shall know what their views concerning it must be in the Augsburg Confession. There must be no contradictions, or their testimony shall have no value. Unless they agree on this point everywhere, they are authorities nowhere.

In his preface to the *Apology of the Augsburg Confession*, Melanchthon calls the Bible the "Scripture of the Holy Ghost." This is a remarkably strong expression, one which a man, who did not believe in inspiration, would not make. The most radical advocate of a diacritical theopneusty, who would claim that even the Hebrew vowel-points were inspired, could not be more emphatic.

An examination of the *Loci Theologici* reveals the same opinion. Though there is in that fountain of Lutheran theology no distinct chapter on inspiration, as all modern writers would have, nevertheless its position on the subject is plain. On page 43 of the Latin text, under the head "*De Spiritu Sancto*," Melanchthon declares: "Also in Zech. 7 : (12) it is said: 'The words which the Lord of hosts had sent by his Spirit by the hand of the

former prophets. By this saying it is furthermore on both sides affirmed, both that the prophets were guided by the Holy Spirit (*gubernatos esse Spiritu Sancto*), and that the word of God is no empty sound, but that the Holy Spirit is present in it, and by that voice moves and kindles minds."

Again on page 51, he begins a beautiful prayer to the Holy Spirit thus: "Holy Spirit, who wast poured out upon the apostles, whom the Son of God has promised to us." It thus becomes clear that the "Teacher of Germany" believed in the inspiration both of the Old and the New Testament. Luther says: "To sum up all, the Holy Bible is the most excellent and best book of God, full of comfort in all temptations; concerning faith, hope and love, it teaches very different things from those which reason can see and feel, comprehend and experience." (Hagenbach, Hist. Doc. II., p. 228.) Again he says: "Many foes, Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek, and Roman, have raged against the Bible, endeavoring to exterminate it; but they have been able to accomplish nothing. They are all gone, but the Book remains forever perfect." ("Watchwords," from Luther, by Mrs. Charles, page 69.)

In another place he designates the Bible as "the Book given by God, the Holy Spirit, to his Church" (Köstlin, Theol. Luth., Vol. II., p. 223.) So also he calls the books of Moses "a writing of the Holy Spirit," and the Holy Spirit he calls *libri autor*, the "author of the book," (idem). Hence his great interpreter, Dr. Köstlin, after acknowledging that we cannot, from the writings of Luther, furnish any precise explanation as to the nature and form of inspiration, makes the following pertinent comment: "Very important materials, however, for the construction of a doctrine of inspiration in accordance with his peculiar view of the subject have been furnished by the foregoing review. Only upon the view of such an inspiration by the Holy Spirit as was peculiar to the Scriptures alone, in contradistinction from the productions of even the most pious and holy Christians of post-apostolic ages, could rest the lofty estimate which Luther entertained of the Bible." (idem, p. 251, Hay).

Add to this expert testimony that of Dr. Hagenbach, another

specialist, that "the Reformers humbly submitted their judgment to the authority of Scripture as a divine revelation," and we are ready to understand that Luther and Melanchthon could not have composed the Augsburg Confession, without letting their sentiments concerning its sure inspiration leak out. Unconsciously they taught the doctrine without even mentioning it. They could not have done otherwise, "for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh" Luke 6:45.

An examination of Luther's Introductions (Vorreden) to various books of the Bible, as well as several general introductions to the Scriptures as a whole, forming volume eleven of the Erlangen edition of 1854, did not furnish expected results. In these prefaces he is so taken up with the biblical contents themselves, that he apparently forgets to tell us whence they came. He is especially zealous in pointing out their evangelical elements. In his mind, as usual, everything must bend to the doctrine of justification by faith.

But on page 18 he shows his exalted view of God's law by declaring that it would be right, "if he were to command us to carry muck or to pick up straws." (Mist tragan oder Strohhalme auetheben). On page 28, he says that the Psalms contain such a summary of the entire Scriptures that it seems to him as though in them "the Holy Spirit himself had wished to go to the trouble of collecting a short Bible." On page 169, he expresses doubt concerning the inspiration of the Apocalypse, saying: "Und allerdinge nicht spuren kann dass es von dem Heiligen Geist gestellet sei"—"and certainly I cannot see that it was arranged by the Holy Spirit." The legitimate inference is that he did consider this to be the case with other books.

Another incidental but real proof that the Lutheran fathers upheld the doctrine of biblical inspiration appears in the fact that they utterly rejected tradition as it was taught by the Romanists. These doctrines and customs which had been handed down from hoary antiquity, first orally and then by means of literature, were not despised as altogether useless. They were given a place and respectful consideration, but they

were strenuously denied parity with the Holy Scriptures. The charge was made against the Romanists that "they demand that their traditions be observed far more accurately than the gospel." (Chap. 14, Apol.) "Human traditions, instituted to propitiate God, to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are opposed to the gospel and the doctrine of faith" (Art. XV.)

"These traditions," declares our Confession, "obscured the commandments of God, because traditions were preferred far above the commandments of God" (XXVI.) The Reformers positively denied inspiration to these traditions. In the Apology Melanchthon declares of them: "Neither are they the effects of the Holy Ghost" (Bk. Con., p. 158). In the Smalcald Articles, Luther says: "It is of no consequence that articles of faith are framed from the works or words of the holy Fathers. * * * We have, however, another rule, viz., that the word of God should frame articles of faith; otherwise no one, not even an angel" (Bk. Con., p. 315).

It is evident that such language can only mean that the Bible is authoritative, because it is inspired of the Holy Spirit, and that tradition is negligible with impunity, because it is simply the opinion of fallible men. Knowing the opposite view of the enemy, whom the Reformers were combatting, we can not honestly come to any other conclusion. From such a contrast a strong argument may legitimately be drawn. The Lutheran position is well stated in the Introduction to the Formula of Concord proper: "Other writings, of ancient or modern teachers, whatever reputation they may have, should not be regarded as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures, but should altogether be subordinated to them" (Bk. Con., p. 461). Why is this distinction made, but to show that one is considered the outflow of a divine, and the other of a human source? The difference between them must be just that.

To establish the point in question further research is unnecessary. Yet it will add strength to the argument if we add, as cumulative proof, the evidence of that theology, which has been the natural outcome of the original fountains which we have already examined. At the same time we will not fall victims to

the weakness of supposing that a long array of quotations can in the least establish a truth. Usually we can find as many so-called authorities on one side as on the other. But Paul interprets Christ; Augustine interprets Paul; Luther, both. Our minor symbols explain the major one. If we have a Lutheran system, it must be consistent. The fruit must agree with the tree. On account of these considerations, we will hear some of our greater theologians on this subject.

Baier gives us a comprehensive definition. He says: "Divine inspiration was that agency by which God supernaturally communicated to the intellect of those who wrote, not only the correct conception of all that was to be written, but also the conception of the words themselves and of everything by which they were to be expressed, and by which he also instigated their will to the act of writing" (Schmid, *Dog.*, p. 57).

Gerhard strongly states the cause as follows: "The instrumental causes of Sacred Scripture were holy men of God, men peculiarly and immediately elected and called by God for the purpose of committing to writing the divine revelations; whom, therefore, we properly call the *amanuenses* of God, the hand of Christ, and the scribes or notaries of the Holy Spirit, since they neither spoke nor wrote by their own human will, but borne along by the Holy Spirit" (idem, p. 60).

Quenstedt thus expresses himself: "God, therefore, alone, if we wish to speak accurately, is to be called the author of the Sacred Scriptures; the prophets and apostles cannot be called the authors, except by a kind of *catachresis*" (idem, p. 60).

Hollazius distinguishes between inspiration and mere supervision: "For the latter merely guards against anything being written that is not true, becoming, congruous; whereas the former, through the Holy Spirit dictating, suggests the conceptions of the things to be written. The divine supervision would warrant the infallibility of the Sacred Scriptures, but not their inspiration" (idem, p. 61).

Quenstedt also notes another distinction, when he says: "We must distinguish between divine revelation when by it the subject-matter itself is made known, and when it refers to the pe-

culiar circumstances and time and manner and order in which the subject-matter is to be reduced to writing." Thus revelation and inspiration are not, strictly speaking, equivalents. "The former could precede the commitment to writing, the latter was always associated with it and flowed over into the writing itself" (idem, p. 67).

Martensen disposes of a mooted distinction as follows: "We must, accordingly, maintain not only the union of the divine and human in Scripture, but at the same time the distinction between these two. The old proposition, *the Scripture is the Word of God* expresses the union; the more modern dictum, *the Scriptures contain the Word of God*, expresses the distinction. The first proposition is clearly preferable to the second, which is vague and indistinct, and may be applied to many writings" (Ch. Dog., p. 403).

Once more we will hear Quenstedt: "There is a great diversity among the sacred writers in regard to style and mode of speaking which appears to arise from the fact that the Holy Spirit accommodated himself to the ordinary mode of speaking, leaving to each one his own manner; yet we do not thereby deny that the Holy Spirit suggested the particular words to these individuals" (Schmid, Dog., p. 65).

From these few specimens culled from the rich field of Lutheran theology, we learn that, though the question of inspiration did not become prominent in the Christian Church till after the Reformation, when it did come up, our leaders were not found wanting. Yet not one of the fathers, so far as appears, ever wrote a special book on the special subject, as so many of the Calvinistic doctors have done.

Calovius, who is credited with being the author of the modern orthodox theory of Protestantism,* declares: "No error, even in unimportant matters, no defect of memory, not to say untruth, can have any place in all the Sacred Scriptures" (Schmid, p. 67). Later teachers, like Tholuck, Dorner, as before them Luther himself, held a more liberal opinion. It is therefore not possible to name any particular theory as the only Lutheran

*Schaff-Herzog, p. 1103).

view. "Inspiration," says Luthardt: "was presupposed as self-evident, but without setting up a theory thereof" (Dog., p. 305).

We have already seen that our symbols simply insist upon the fact of inspiration, and rest the matter there. The Bible itself does no more. Yet it may justly be claimed that the general trend of our theology is toward the plenary hypothesis. But this idea is extended not to any recension, translation, or extant codex, but only to the long-lost autographic manuscripts.

It is easy to predict that we will, at least we may, soon see this subject become a live issue again. Perhaps it may agitate Christendom as it never has done before. This will be owing to the disturbances of the Higher Criticism as to the contents of the Bible. The Holy Book as literature is in the crucible. But even if it could be satisfactorily proven, from internal evidence, that Moses did not write the Pentateuch, but that it is the composite product of several authors, such as the Jehovah, Elohist, Priest, and Deuteronomist, who perhaps were mostly redactors themselves, why should not their editing have been inspired? Why should not a providential superintendence have been granted them, so that they should have eliminated all fiction or fable from the primitive sources, tablets, documents, or oral traditions and given us the real truth only? Thus the inspiration of the whole would insure the inspiration of the parts, just as now orthodoxy holds that the inspiration of the parts establishes that of the whole. If a divinely guided Ezra adjusted and reconstructed the Old Testament canon, it still is the Word of God. In E. A. Allen's "History of Civilization," written on the Darwinian basis, though accepting the results of the Higher Criticism, he says with reference to Creation: "It seems to us that one of the strongest arguments that the writer of Genesis was in some way assisted in his work by divine guidance, lies in the fact that he rejected so many details set forth in the Babylonian account" (Vol. I., p. 711). The compilation theory of biblical evolution is not necessarily destructive. One may at the same time be an honest literary critic of the Scriptures and yet remain a devout believer in their inspiration.

It is well known that the disciples of the Higher Criticism

profess great reverence for the Holy Book. We may safely give them credit for sincerity. Nevertheless we are more favorably impressed by the apparent inerrancy of the Bible, than by that of the literary ferrets who would be wiser than Moses. What Luther said, shortly before his death, of another kind of fault-finders, is very applicable to those of modern times: "Since then the Bible, which is the Holy Spirit's own special book, writing, and which (Geistes eingen, sonderlich Buch), must thus suffer from them, and be reviled as the mother and protectress of all heresy, why should not we suffer much more, in that they charge us with all heresy and sedition? A spider sucks poison out of the lovely rose, wherein a bee finds nothing but honey. What can she help, that her sweet honey becomes poison to the spider?" (Erl. Ed. Works, p. 415).

But whatever may happen, until we shall reach the higher realms of light the following resumé of Luthardt will remain the conviction of Lutheranism: "In the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, in which the revelation of salvation has deposited itself as in a complete and corresponding document of its own, the Church possesses that word of God which, over against ecclesiastical tradition and teaching, forms the determining norm, which is necessary to the Church for the fulfilling of her mission in the world, (namely) to bear witness to the truth of salvation in word and deed—an acknowledgment of the supreme authority of the Scriptures, in which in doctrine the Church indeed never failed (welcher der Kirche zwar in der Lehre nie fehlte), but which first came into full recognition and practical value at the Reformation. On the ground of that necessity and signification of the Scriptures the Church also is certain that the origin of the same is to be ascribed to a special operation of the Spirit of Revelation (inspiration) which employed the faculties of the writers, as the object both of the individual book and of Scripture as a whole demanded" (Comp. Dog., p. 299).

The Polychrome Bible cannot obscure the rain-bow of the covenant. As Luther declares in his Larger Catechism: "No man has spun the Ten Commandments, the Creed and the

Lord's Prayer out of his head, but they are revealed and given by God himself" (Bk. Con., p. 466).

It is therefore plain that our great Church can lift up her head anywhere among believers in the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. She has always been loyal in the past. She will not fail in the future. Though unbelief should succeed in demolishing all structural theories and hypotheses, our Church will extricate herself from the ruins, and again take her stand, without any theory, upon the adamantine rock of the fact of inspiration. To her, though all besides may be shattered, truth and Christ forever remain, untouched by the destructive criticisms of men.

ARTICLE VIII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY PROF. DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

Canon Newbolt in his deeply spiritual book, entitled, "Speculum Sacredotum," says, that "it is almost startling to think of the immense number of sermons which are poured forth week by week from the pulpits of the land." The volume of this homiletic work is a tribute to the religious thoughtfulness of English-speaking people. A glance at the table of contents likewise of such a magazine as Salmond's "Critical Review," gives some indication of the immense importance attached by large classes of the same people to theological discussion, much of it of a high and somewhat abstruse order. The quarterly visits of this journal gives no countenance to the widely current slander on the "Queen of the Sciences," that people are no longer interested in theological dissertations. Here one always finds a big array of books, upon the greatest of all themes, and many of them of such a grasp upon the subject discussed and of such literary form, as to make them of permanent value. For exam-

ple, in the October number, we find in the large list such books as Newbolt's finely written and thoughtful book on "Religion," somewhat Anglican in its partisanship, but marked by a sweet spirit: Campbell's Gifford lectures on "Religion in Greek Literature," something out of the line yet given in that fine series of books, in which the author indicates the "man's steps in the ascent from Homer's childish fancies to the colossal heights of Plato's contemplations": "The trial of Jesus Christ: a legal monograph," by A. Taylor Innes, a deeply interesting study that supplies a real want in English literature, and which the *Review* earnestly commends "for its carefulness and power, and for its commanding interest;" Principal Simon's Reconciliation by Incarnation, a mature and elaborate discussion at the hands of a capable specialist who has devoted long study and enthusiasm to the discussion of a great theme. Of him the *Review* says: "He is a follower, in an exclusive sense, of no man, but by this fresh example of patient and vigorous thinking has approved himself a master in this department and given us a volume which must be pronounced an important contribution to British Theology;" and the "works of Dionysius the Areopagite," now first translated by the Rev. John Parker, M. A. Of this work the *Reviewer* says:

"Dionysius, notwithstanding Vaughan's half-humorous depreciation of him, was a profound and subtle thinker. His works mark the complete interfusion of ecclesiastical Christianity with Oriental mysticism. And his doctrine exerted a powerful influence upon the religious thought of England, from the twelfth century to the sixteenth."

The *English Church Quarterly Review* for October contains three articles of special interest in current religious discussion. These articles involve the important doctrines of the Church and the Scriptures, and are constituted by three reviews of as many books by leading specialists in their respective departments of study and scholarship. (1.) The first of these is a study of the "Roman Primacy," by the Rev. Luke Rivington, D. D., who for his literary services was recompensed by Pope

Leo XIII., with the degree of Doctor of Divinity. The *Review* at the very beginning of its article sagaciously calls attention to the ambiguity involved in the very title of Dr. Rivington's treatise, and raises thereby a very important and interesting question in the history of the papacy.

"What is meant by 'the Roman Primacy'? The term is notoriously elastic, therefore indefinite, therefore misleading. An arguer does not promote, but rather hinders, a just perception of issues involved, if he summarizes his thesis in a word which opponents may use in diverse senses—one may say, in this case, which suits his opponents' thesis considerably better than his own. Dr. Rivington shows repeatedly in this book that he is well aware—indeed, he could not possibly be unaware—of the fact that Anglicans acknowledge a 'primacy' in St. Peter, and a 'primacy' in the Roman See of primitive times. But the point to be emphasized is that, while there are primacies and primacies, while a 'princeps senatus' has a secular 'primacy' in one sense, and a Diocletian in another, while Athens of old had by right a 'hegemony,' but was resisted when she asserted a 'dominion,' the polity which a Roman writer pleads for, as *jure divino* essential to Church life, is a primacy of a dominant and practically absolute kind. Why, then, should he not frankly entitle his book 'The Papal Monarchy in 430-451?'"

(2.) The second of these articles, which we have read with peculiar interest is a lengthy review of Prof. Briggs' "Introduction to the study of Holy Scripture." It is an elaborate and searching piece of work. It is sharp, candid and scholarly, and to our way of thinking, leaves but little of the hypothetical assumptions of the distinguished Union Seminary Professor. We regret that lack of space forbids us to give citations at length from the gratifying exhibit made in this paper. Speaking of the method of the critics the *Review* says: "They start from certain premises, in many respects hypothetical and imaginary, and deduce from them certain conclusions more or less in accord therewith, but which certainly do not follow from the premises assumed even if true, and which are

worth nothing if those premises are false. It becomes wearisome after a time to find one man after another playing the game of 'follow my leader,' and repeating assertions which they all find it convenient to forget, have never been, and cannot be, verified." "Assumption in proof of hypothesis and hypothesis as the basis of assumption, is the character of much that passes under the imposing and majestic name of Higher Criticism."

"The Higher Critics arrogate to themselves the exclusive possession of scholarship, and talk loudly about the 'best scholarship,' the great majority of modern scholars, and the like, as though there were nothing to be said on the other side, and as if nothing had been said on a matter by no means one of pure scholarship by Robertson, Blomfield, Baxter, Kennedy, Care, Spencer, Stanley Leattus, Lias and others, much of which we are bold to say, not only has not been answered, but which never can be answered."

"There is so much juggling in this matter. Dr. Briggs is very careful to lay it down as one of the many laws of thought, governing alike Higher Criticism and other things, that everything is either A, or not A; everything is either a given thing or something which is not a given thing; there is no mean between two contradictory propositions. Then if this is so, that which we have is a revelation, or it is not a revelation; if it is not a revelation, then away with it; no expulsion of the unclean thing can be too violent; but if we have a revelation then by all the laws of reason and science it must fulfill certain conditions, it must present certain credentials,—if, that is, we are to judge of it."

In this article we have found one of the keenest analysis of the hypothetical position of the critics to be found anywhere in the current discussion of the important questions at issue.

(3.) The third article referred to in the *Review*, has to deal also with an up-to-date question that has to do particularly with the validity of the Old Testament writings. It is a review and *resume* of a series of essays recently published upon the general subject of "Authority and Archaeology." Prof. A. H. Sayce is probably the best authority cited in this book. The

editor sums up the results as archæological investigations as follows :

"We are bound to ask ourselves whether we feel that the Old and New Testaments have suffered any damage by the tests to which they have been put by the essayists. Our line of argument hitherto has been (1) that, on the whole, archaeology is confirmatory, not subversive, of the traditional position; (2) that archaeology is intended to be supplementary to and illustrative of history; (3) that our authorities are to be trusted unless they can be proved to be wrong; and (4) that the discoveries of archaeology are not necessarily to be regarded as infallible, both because of a certain 'subjectivity' underlying some of them, and because we have evidence of 'restorations' at certain periods, which make us suspicious of hasty conclusions."

"We have no cause to be disappointed at the results of archæological research. We believe that, on the whole, the traditional view of the Bible has gained by being tested with the new evidence, and we think that another twenty years of patient research and study will confirm its position, much in the same way as Schliemann's views twenty years since upon prehistoric Greece, after being ridiculed, have been amply justified."

The leading article in the October number of the *American Journal of Theology* we should say is that of Prof. William Rupp, D. D., on "Ethical Postulates in Theology." Dr. Rupp very clearly has some of the expressions of the Latin theology in view in some things that he affirms, with no small degree of candor, and with a strong grasp on his subject, as for example: "Dogmatic Theology especially affords illustrations between theological definition and ethical principles, of which we are now speaking. Such antagonisms appeared especially in the doctrine of sin, and in the doctrine of soteriology. Here the ethical character which dogmatics itself, in its doctrine of God, attributes to him, is often utterly forgotten, and he is represented as violating the commonest ethical principles in his dealings with men. For instance, outside of theology, it is a universally recognized principle that personal freedom and responsibility are correlative."

"But now this fundamental principle of justice has been violated by a whole series of dogmatic definitions, about some of which a fierce battle is still raging." It is violated, for instance, by the doctrine of absolute predestination, according to which the eternal weal or woe of men is determined, not by their own freedom, but by the absolute and causeless pleasure of the creator."

We are disposed to think that there would be considerable dissent from the judgment expressed in the conclusion of Dr. Rupp's article: "The present widespread disaffection of the masses toward the Church we verily believe, has not its cause so much in the native depravity of the human heart, or in the prevailing influence of infidel science which denies the supernatural, as in the unethical form in which the gospel has been so generally presented. And this unethical presentation of the gospel, we hold, has not been true to Christ and the New Testament, and was therefore, *bound to fail*."

One of the most interesting and profitable articles in the latest issue of the *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* is that of Professor James Lindsay, on "Mysticism True and False." The article is a plea for a true mysticism in an age prone to go after things that can be seen and handled only. Prof. Lindsay says sincerely and truly:

"We should clear our minds of cant in such matters—cant which is no less cant because it is common. If the past excrescences of mystical tendency were greater than they are, that would not justify our giving way to the superficiality which sees not the central core to be preserved in all true mysticism. Our fears of religious rapture are quite superfluous: the hand of the world is too surely upon our wrist. It was reserved for our saintly fathers to ask God to withhold his hand lest the human vessel should burst. No, all the mysticism we shall be able to muster will barely suffice to keep our souls in health in this naturalistic time, wherein rationalism and formalism are never far to seek. Does it need to be said that an accession of interior force is the crying need of such spiritual life as remains to us? This is not to exclude thought from a single province—even that of feeling—

but it is to remind the proud omnipotence of thought that the heights of heavenly vision are open to it only as it is wedded to the spiritual insight of a pure and loving heart."

The leading article in the October number of the "*Bibliotheca Sacra*" is that of that valiant, conservative scholar, the late Dr. Samuel C. Bartlett, entitled "Rupprecht on the Pentateuch." He has presented a fine summary for English readers of a thoroughly conservative and able work on the Pentateuch, which as coming from Germany he declares to be a "noteworthy phenomenon," Dr. B. thinks that there are two reasons why the work of Rupprecht is to be viewed with special interest:

First, as the token of a strong conservative movement in Germany. It is intensely evangelical in its spirit, exalting in the strongest form the authority of both the Old and New Testaments. No volume published recently on either side of the Atlantic excels it in this respect. And it is not alone. To the same purport is George Stosch's book, "The Origin of Genesis" (1897), written, as he says in his preface, "to prove that there still exists in Germany a school of theology bound in obedience to the word of God," and "as a defense against the destructive criticisms of a disintegrating science." Less scholarly in method, it is a reverential and popular exhibition of the "external and internal coherence of" the book of Genesis as designed to "comprise the record of a wondrous history." It was somewhat longer ago (1890) that Dr. Adolph Zahn published his defense of Deuteronomy "against the disorderly procedure (*Unwesen*) of modern criticism,"—a method, he avers, unknown in secular historical investigation, and permitted only in the territory of the Scriptures; one which makes of the Pentateuch especially "a heap of ruins that harmonizes well with the desolation of the Church which surrounds us on every hand." In 1894 he published his "Sober View of Modern Criticism," which brought him such a return of appreciation and encouragement as proved that there still is a Church which holds fast the truths of the Bible. In 1893 Hermann Billieb issued his defense of the Pentateuch, founded on the evidence of the old prophets

Hosea and Amos (like the volume of Professor Robertson, 1892,) in which he shows that "a divine providence has taken care that these historical prophets, standing on the outpost of the kingdom of the ten tribes, should become incontrovertible witnesses, and abundant in their testimony." These bold utterances of German pastors, are put forth in the very presence of all the learned ingenuity.

The *New World* may be said fairly to represent the most advanced type of liberal thinking on religious topics, especially that widely current in New England. The last issue contains an unusually able and interesting table of contents, from which we may note of special interest, "Jesus' Foreknowledge of His Sufferings and Death," by Otto Pfleiderer; the "Genesis of Faith," by Albert Gehring; and the "Scientific and Christian View of Illness," by James T. Bixley.

The *Contemporary Review* contains an excellent article by Professor Sabatier, on a theme about which much that is wise and much otherwise, has been written in recent times. He discusses a live theological question in the article entitled, "Christian Dogma and the Christian Life." The writer is clearly of the opinion that men have not lost interest in theology. He says: "The labors and progress of scientific theology, in our time, are neither less rich nor less worthy of admiration than those accomplished in our day, by all the other sciences." The last question discussed by Mr. Sabatier is this: "What shall be our attitude as regards the formularies and the dogmatic symbols in use among different churches." "Our attitude" says he, "cannot be either a blind reaction or a violent rupture; it can neither be an adhesion without criticism, nor a revolt without piety. How can we with a good conscience break with the traditions of the first centuries, or with the protestant tradition of modern centuries, when we have the conviction that we are their legitimate children, and the desire to reap and cultivate their inheritance?" "The more I advance the more I feel attached to the tradition of my fathers by all the very roots of my life and

in thinking of my old Reformed Church of France, of its liturgy, of the old confession of faith, of its psalms and canticles, I feel I can cry aloud with the old Hebrew poet, exiled on the banks of the Euphrates: 'Jerusalem, if I forget thee, may my right hand forget itself.' And this is no easy sceptical adaptation, a sort of disdainful or hypocritical diplomatic arrangement; it is rather the love and gratitude of a child. Ingathering with reverence all the moral riches of this family tradition, my most ardent desire would be to prolong it and to make it yet more fruitful."

"To confirm us in this method and in this course of conduct, we have the example even of Jesus Christ. We know what was his attitude in reference to the law of Moses and the tradition of his people. No Israelite was ever attached to them with a more sincere heart or deeper piety. Far from breaking with the part. He desired that his gospel should be to all, a continuation and a crowning work. No doubt the new matter which he brought disagreed with certain rabbinical traditions, or modified them by broadening out certain prescriptions of the law; but on the other hand, his teaching set forth the deeper spirit, the religious and moral ideal of the sacred code and of the old prophecies, and he could in all truth declare that he came not to destroy but to fulfill the law and the prophets. Such is the way in which we, too, attach ourselves positively to the dogmatic traditions of the Church."

II.

GERMAN.

BY REV. S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A. M.

For some time back scientific investigation of the life of Christ begins with the promise that the founder of Christian religion, in spite of his peculiar personality and his meaning for the world's history, belonged to his own time and race, and consequently busies itself with determining how much the thought and life of Jesus were influenced, not merely as to form but also as to content, by the Jewish expectation of the Messiah, or to

what extent they transcended Judaism. However, some of the most recent writers on this theme have refused to follow this new way of treating the subject, and have used the former methods. Starting out from opposition to the Church's doctrine of the Trinity, and attempting to prove that Christ was a true man, they strive by this new method to set the genuinely human elements in the opinions and sayings of Jesus in their true light. This emphasis of the human side causes the special historical solving of the life-picture and preaching of Jesus to disappear, and puts in its place a more or less pronounced modernization of the same. Hollenberg's pamphlet on "The Religion of Jesus Christ" belongs to this category, which is characterized by a dogmatic gleaming of information which touches religious history, and not by exact historic investigation. He concludes that faith in God the Father was the central life-giving truth that Christ preached. Jesus understood by "the kingdom of God" not only the moral world, but God's immanence in the world—the unity of God and world. The "kingdom of God" and the "kingdom of the world are essentially the same."—Just the very opposite of Jesus' teaching. It is a picture of Jesus in the sense of enlightenment according to the plan of Lessing. Jesus is "the classic religious genius of humanity that transcends all else," the preacher of "ethical humanism."

To give a brief presentation of the synoptic question as it stands to-day in Germany, would probably cause a German professor to hesitate. That which is attempted here is merely a digest of certain reviews of recent literature on the subject (particularly Zahn's "Introduction to the New Testament") which have appeared in the *Theologisches Literaturzeitung*, *Theologisches Literaturblatt*, *Allgemeine Evangelische Luterische Kirchenzeitung*, *Theologische Rundschau*, and an article in the sixth volume of Mensel's *Kirchliches Handlexicon* which came out during the year.

Stated in few words the question is this: In reading the first three gospels we are impressed by their striking similarities and dissimilarities; what do they mean and whence are they? From

the very first, students of the New Testament have tried to answer this question, and now Johannes Weiss of Marburg informs us that we are "farther than ever from agreeing even in the most important fundamental things"—a rather extreme statement as many of Johannes Weiss' declarations are. Some have attempted an answer by assuming that each evangelist used the gospels which he found already written, and that our present arrangement is chronological (Augustin, Hugo Grotius, Wettstein and Bengel. Beza placed Luke first). Then the answer was sought by assigning one or several common sources. A number of rationalists accepted this theory (Lessing and Semler). Eichhorn postulated a Syro-Chaldean gospel from which the synoptics come. Others thought they would answer it by conceiving of these gospels as springing from a fixed Aramaic type of tradition. (Sartorius and recently Wetzel and Veit). About 1830 De Wette and Sieffert concluded that the passage from Papias quoted by Eusebius in his Church History, which speaks of Matthew as having written "the words" of Jesus, did not fit Matthew as we have it, but some primitive gospel written by the apostle in Hebrew or Aramaic and lost. About this time the priority of Mark was advanced and the most natural conclusion that could be drawn was that Mark and the "logia" of Matthew were used by the writers of the first three gospels.

This gives us the hypothesis of two common sources as an answer to the question, which in more or less divergent forms is now more widely accepted than any other theory. Its chief support is found in the fact that by excluding from the first and third gospels the didactic elements common to both, we have left a series of narrations that are practically the same as the second gospel which, it is claimed, proves that the writers of the first and third gospels used the second as a sort of frame-work into which they put didactic elements from some other source—in all probability the logia of Matthew. This theory numbers among its advocates, Holtzmann, Harnack, Schuerer, Johannes Weiss, Juelicher and the venerable Bernhard Weiss of Berlin, who probably excels all others in his thorough mastery of the

subject. He teaches that there were two written sources, canonical Mark, or a work almost identical with it, which contained chiefly narratives of the life and work of Christ, and the logia of Matthew, which contained his sayings with a comparatively small proportion of the narrative element. The authors of Matthew and Luke knew and used both these sources, but neither writer knew or used the other's work, (vide his introduction to N. T., 3rd edition 1897 and commentaries on Mark and Matthew, 1872 and 1876). He teaches that the small narrative element in the logia was used by Mark, and therefore that by studying Mark and the passages common to both Matthew and Luke we can approach the character of this primitive source. This has been attempted in English by Blair, and in German by a Thuringian pastor, A. Resch, who made his life-work the reconstruction of the primitive gospel that lies back of our synoptic gospels—a real gospel with narrative parts and addresses which is intended to be none other than the logia written by Matthew to which Papias referred. In doing this he uses not only our gospels but also extra-canonical parallel texts. The Greek text that he thus gets is often quite different from that of our gospels. G. Dalman has also begun the publication of a work of a somewhat similar character, "The Words of Jesus." It promises to be of use, because of the Rabbinical light it claims to throw on certain cardinal expressions that Jesus used in speaking of himself and man, such as "Son of man," "Kingdom of God," "Kingdom of Heaven," etc.

A recent book by Hadorn on the genesis of Mark ignores entirely the theory of two sources and claims that our second gospel was constructed from Matthew's logia, and that which Mark remembered from Peter's narration. (This second source is recognized by almost all N. T. students).

Zahn in Vol. II. of his N. T. Introduction, though he treats the gospels at considerable length, devotes a comparatively small space to their interrelation, *i. e.*, to the synoptic question proper, for which many condemn him. He lays down as a fundamental principle that the individual peculiarities of each gospel must be known and mastered before we are in a position

to consider the question at all, and consequently devotes the greater part of his energy and space to a thorough analysis of the several gospels. The course of his investigation is this: First of all the tradition concerning the gospel is given, and then its text and contents are analyzed to see whether they agree with and confirm tradition. This method has called forth much severe criticism from his opponents, among whom are Schuerer and Johannes Weiss. They claim that he is prejudiced in favor of tradition and is consequently unfair in his analysis often forcing a text till he gets from it that which he wants. But Steinmetz remarks concerning these criticisms that these traditions are so old and approach so near to the time of the writing of the gospels that no investigator can ignore them. Zahn, Vol. II., p. 193, writes: "As touching tradition, the keenest critics with few unsatisfactory exceptions have shown so much historical sense that they sought supports for their hypotheses in the oldest reports concerning the origin of the gospels, but generally with an arbitrary choice." In paragraph 49 he gives the tradition for all three gospels and then devotes a special paragraph to the tradition for each individual gospel. Mark is treated before Matthew, probably because this gospel antedates Matthew in Greek.

Zahn is of the opinion that a certain guiding purpose was present in the mind of each gospel writer which furnishes the reason why the material is arranged as it is and not otherwise. The purpose of Mark is found in the first verse, which is not intended to apply to one particular chapter but to the entire book. The beginning of the gospel was the preaching of Christ, not that of John the Baptist which is accordingly briefly mentioned. The purpose of Matthew is also announced in the first verse. "It is an historic defense of the Nazarene and his followers over against Judaism." Luke was written to give the history of Christianity up to a certain point in such a way that a cultured heathen (Theophilus) would get an impression of the reliability of Christian traditions.

Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew or Aramaic, while Paul and Peter were preaching in Rome, or about 62. The reference

to it by Papias as "the words" or "the sayings" merely describes its chief characteristic. The original is lost. Our Matthew is a Greek translation made by some unknown person about the year 85, who had before him Mark's gospel, which influenced his choice of words and expressions.

Mark is really the first gospel written that we have in its original form. The difference between the account by Irenaeus and that of Clemens Alexandrinus, one placing it before and the other after the death of Peter, is explained by assuming that Mark begun his gospel during Peter's life and did not complete it, or at least did not publish it, till after his martyrdom. Mark gives us accounts of things heard from Peter, certain events that he himself witnessed (the scene in the garden) and some facts gathered from other sources, among which was Matthew's gospel in the original.

The book closes with the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter. Luke wrote the third gospel about 75 and used Mark, but it is not likely that he used Matthew. That which our first and third gospels have in common, not found in the record, is best explained by assuming that they got it from oral tradition. An examination of the text of Matthew gives us no reason at all for concluding that he used written sources.

It will be seen from this that Zahn's position is different from any other held at the present time and flatly contradicts the popular theory of two sources. In several important respects it is a return to the first answer ever given to the synoptic problem.

Recently the literature on the historical books of the Old Testament, which is small as compared with that which treats of the other divisions of the Old Testament, received the addition of Budde's Commentary on Judges, Benzinger's Commentary on Kings and a third edition of Thenius' work on Samuel by Toehr, so competely revised as almost to pass for a new work. The first and second of these books are representative of a rather extreme type of Old Testament criticism. They show the extent to which men dare to go in distinguishing sources and revisions. Budde's conclusions as to sources are as follows: the older

source was Judaistic and is the same as Judges of the former Old Testament books. It contains in connection with the account of entrance the stories Jehud, Jabin, Gideon, Abimelech, Jephthah, Samson, the wandering of the Danites and the history of Gibeah. The later or theocratic source originated in northern Israel (E) and contains the accounts of Jehud, Deborah and Barak, Gideon, Abimelech, Jephthah and the wandering of the Danites, but instead of the story of Samson it has that of Samuel as the conqueror of the Philistines. Both were united into one writing by a redactor probably after 650 B. C., and then the result was worked over in the interests of the Deuteronomic school, of which editing or revising there are traces, particularly in 2 : 6-3 : 6. Then there was a renewed Deuteronomic redaction. And finally about 400 B. C. it was edited again in the interests of the priesthood.

Benzinger in his commentary on Kings concludes that 1 and 2 Kings are made up from two very different sources. The one contained short notes on annals brought together without any reflection. The other was made up of a number of detailed narratives, some of which were popular and others devotional in style and are of very different historical value. With the exception of the account of the temple they are all biographical sketches. The account of Solomon must have been edited before the compiler touched it. Benzinger then attempts to show that there were really two redactors—the latter of whom put the book in such a condition that we can speak of a real plan. Knenen disagrees with this. Toehr, in his re-edited commentary of Thenius on 1 and 2 Samuel, rejects all theories as to different sources and redactions and concludes that the entire work came from one author. As might be expected his book has been severely criticized. Kautzsch may be taken as representative of those who differ. He teaches that there were three different writers at work on the book at as many different times.

ARTICLE IX.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

*The Lutheran Cyclopedi*a. Edited by Henry Eyster Jacobs, D. D., LL. D., Dean of the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa., and Rev. John A. W. Haas, B. D. With the co-operation of Professor O. Zoeckler, University of Greifswald, and other European Scholars and Representative Scholars from the various synods.

At the meeting of the General Synod at Harrisburg, Pa., in 1885, the Board of the Lutheran Publication Society was "recommended to secure at the earliest practical time the preparation and publication of a cyclopedia of Lutheranism." For reasons not made public, that recommendation was not carried into effect. The late Christian Literature Company took the initiative in the preparation of the present volume, and the result of compliance with its urgent request, is "a summary of the chief topics comprised in the doctrine, the life, the customs, the history, and the statistics of the Lutheran Church." That one of the desiderata of the Lutheran Church has been met in the publication of this volume, and that it will be "of immense service to all our departments of labor," is gratefully conceded. That the preparation of articles by contributors was a labor of love, is evidenced by the fact that, November 1st 1900, they are to receive one dollar per page for their contributions.

"The book is a library condensed, containing information that cannot be gathered elsewhere with shelves full of authorities." Many of the articles have been written by specialists, and out of the fulness of empirical knowledge. Noteworthy features are sketches of men and institutions of learning, of synods and churches, statistics, Luther's Ninety-five Theses, Claus Harms' Ninety-five Theses, Lutheran Chronology. As a rule a just balance has been struck between too much and too little, though some subjects have been expanded out of proportion to their importance for American Lutherans. Why should more than three columns be given to Rev. William Loehe, and, upon an average, less than half so much space be allotted to Muhlenberg, Schmucker, Krauth and Mann? Why should Swedenborg have nearly a column, and Franz Delitzsch only half a column? Indeed, what claim has Swedenborg to a place in a Lutheran cyclopedia? Why should the Luther League, which is too young to have a history, be given nearly three columns, and the Evangelical Alliance be put off with half a column? If the latter merits a place in this book, it merits fuller treatment. And why was not the name of Dr. S. S. Schmucker, who in 1846

was called "the father of the Alliance," mentioned in this article? And why should some eight or ten columns be given to German and Scandinavian Homiletical Literature, which can be of but little use to American readers, and the English Sermons of only Seiss, Loy and Kuegele be mentioned? Why were Stork, Miller, Rhodes and Valentine, of the General Synod, overlooked? The editors ought to have supplemented the partial list offered by Mr. Hoffmann.

We are especially pleased with the articles on persons, places and countries of Germany. The information conveyed by these articles is just what we so often need. Many of such articles have been furnished by Dr. Spaeth. They could not have emanated from a more intelligent source. Dr. Spaeth has seen, and by observation and experience has known, much that he describes. Very learnedly and lovingly has he written of "*Wuertemberg, Luth. Church in.*" He who reads this article will not thereafter sniffler at "the Lutheran Church in Wuertemberg at present numbering about 1,500,000 souls, with 1000 pastors, under six general superintendents, and 49 superintendents," p. 553.

The chief articles setting forth the doctrine, cultus, polity and *Symboli* of the Lutheran Church are the following:

Administration of the Sacrament,	Dr. Horn.
Agenda, Consensus of,	Dr. Horn.
Altar-Fellowship,	Drs. Fritschel and Valentine.
Apology of the Augsburg Confession,	Mr. Haas.
Augsburg Confession,	Dr. Zoeckler.
Baptism,	Dr. Weidner.
Catechisms,	Dr. Spaeth.
Catechisation,	Dr. Spaeth.
Christology,	Mr. Haas.
Church,	Dr. Jacobs.
Church Polity,	Dr. Jacobs.
Common Service,	Dr. Horn.
Confession and Absolution,	Dr. Jacobs.
Dogmatics,	Drs. Weidner and Jacobs.
Ethics,	Mr. Haas.
Form of Concord,	Dr. Jacobs.
Freedom of the Will,	Mr. Haas.
Fundamentals,	Dr. Jacobs.
Gospel,	Dr. Jacobs.
Grace,	Dr. Weidner.
Hymnody,	Dr. Spaeth.
Justification,	Drs. Gerberding and Jacobs.
Kirchenordnung,	Dr. Spaeth.
Liturgy,	Dr. Horn.
Lord's Supper,	Dr. Jacobs.
Ministry,	Mr. Haas.

Ordination,	Dr. Horn.
Power of the Keys,	Dr. Jacobs.
Predestination,	Prof. Graebner, Drs. Fritschel and Jacobs.
Sacraments,	Dr. Jacobs.
Symbolics,	Dr. Jacobs.
Sunday,	Dr. Jacobs.
Word of God,	Dr. Jacobs.

It will thus be seen that nearly all the *distinguishing* doctrinal and confessional articles were written by four or five General Council theologians, the name of the Senior Editor appearing fifteen times, and that of the Junior Editor, four times, in the list of articles given above. That is, a few General Council theologians are the authors of nearly all the *distinctive* doctrinal teaching in this volume. The teaching is characteristically that of the Form of Concord, and of the seventeenth century dogmatists. The influence of the dogmatic coryphaei of the nineteenth century,—von Hofmann, Kahnis, Frank, Luthardt, *et al.*,—is scarcely, if at all, perceptible. And yet these men, with a love of truth, and a fidelity to conviction, equal to that of the dogmatists; with a more varied culture, and with a superior philosophical, biblical and literary apparatus, have developed the doctrinal teaching of the Lutheran Church and made it fuller, richer, more scriptural and practical, than it became in the hands of the men of two hundred and fifty and three hundred years ago. Indeed, they were greater theologians than the old dogmatists, on the principle that a pigmy standing on the shoulders of a giant can see further than a giant; though they were by no means pygmies. They were the Lutheran giants of the nineteenth century. But of their teaching our authors seem to be well-nigh oblivious. Reading their articles one gets the impression that the stream of Lutheran doctrine emanating from Wittenberg, after meandering over Germany for a century and a half, had, like the Gaudalquivir, suddenly disappeared, and then two hundred years later had sprung up in divers places in America.

But what of the fact that no name of a General Synod professor of didactic theology appears in connection with any distinctive Lutheran article?—if we except “Altar-Fellowship,” which is not strictly doctrinal. This may have been accidental, but it is a fact nevertheless. The “representative scholars” from other synods are not quite so conspicuous by the absence of their names from this class of articles.

All the leading articles connected with liturgy and cultus are from the pens of two General Council theologians, Drs. Horn and Spaeth. Not for one moment would we impeach the liturgical learning of these worthy Christian gentlemen. But they are understood to be disciples of the Romanizing Khefeth and Loehe, and to entertain certain very extreme notions on some points connected with worship, notions which, to use the language of the very distinguished von Zezschwitz, not a few

Lutherans in this country, and nearly all Lutheran liturgical scholars in Germany, regard as more or less *cultus-idealizing, Puseyizing, Romanizing*.

We cannot but wonder why the names of Dr. Schuette and Rev. Frederick Lochner,—quite the peers of any Lutheran liturgiologists in this country,—do not appear in connection with this class of articles.

It thus appears that a very disproportionately large part of the *educative* articles in this volume,—those which determine the character of its doctrinal and liturgical teaching,—come from the pens of about half a dozen “representative scholars” of the General Council. In other words, in this volume the General Council so far becomes the teacher of the American Lutheran Church in doctrine and cultus, that already we have heard the book called “*The General Council Cyclopedias*;” and yet from the very nature of the case General Synod ministers and laymen are expected to be very frequent purchasers of this book. How they will take it that so few of *their* “representative scholars” participate in the *educative* features of this book, remains to be seen. General Synod men, however, have an honorable place among the writers of history, biography and colorless subjects.

We now give attention to some points in detail:

1. On p. 3, Dr. Horn treats of *Agenda, Consensus of*. Nothing could better demonstrate the *dissensus* of the Lutheran Agenda than Dr. Horn’s diagram and the accompanying explanation. Hence we must enter our respectful but decided *non libert* against this article. We have read some thousands of pages on the Lutheran Agenda, written by the most eminent German liturgiologists; but not once have we found the equivalent of *Consensus of Agenda*. On the contrary we have again and again met with affirmations and demonstrations of the greatest variety of the Lutheran Agenda. In the preface to this very volume the Senior Editor declares that “there was the greatest diversity” in liturgy in the Lutheran Church. And when on pp. 123-4 Dr. Horn in various ways speaks of the Common Service as the common consent, etc., we must say: *Quod non demonstratum est*. Just ten years ago (January, 1890) in the *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY*, we alleged that, part for part, form for form, word for word, the Common Service is almost identical with Loehe’s Liturgy of 1883-4; and that in fulness and elaborateness, in the number of so-called “enrichments,” the Common Service transcends any Lutheran liturgy of the sixteenth century. We ask Dr. Horn to exhibit a Lutheran Liturgy of the sixteenth century that is so full, so elaborate, as the Common Service. So long as men ring the changes on the “common consent,” we have a right to ask such a favor, and to point to our published exhibitions in the *LUTHERAN QUARTERLY* for 1890, pp. 182-3, 493, 498. For with us it has not been a question of liturgy or no liturgy; much less, opposition to *Lutheran* liturgy, but a question of *fact*.

2. The article on the Augsburg Confession, pp. 29 *et seqq.*, is from the pen of Dr. Zoeckler. In the treatment of the Schwabach Articles "which Luther himself had edited ;" of the Torgau Articles, "the majority of which clearly bear the impress of Melanchthon's authorship"; of the one and only sending to Luther, May 11th, and Luther's approval, May 15th; of the relation of the Schwabach Articles to the first seventeen articles of the Confession, and of the Torgau Articles to the second part,—of these and other important points Dr. Zoeckler writes in essential harmony with the treatment of the same points in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for July, 1897, July, 1898, October, 1899.

But he has committed some palpable inaccuracies: Not "at the beginning of March" [1530] but March 14th "the Elector asked for a detailed apology of the evangelical standpoint." Not "five days after the Emperor's entrance into Augsburg," but nine days after, Friday, June 24th "the evangelical princes obtained not without great difficulty, the imperial permission for public reading of their Confession." (See this No. of the QUARTERLY, pp. 43, 51). The Confession was not "almost completed" when sent to Luther, May 11th. (LUTH. QUARTERLY, Oct., 1899, p. 521 and note).

On p. 31, Dr. Zoeckler, writing of the *Editio Variata* of 1540, says: "But not a few of these Locupletionen effected rather the introduction of the synergistic mode of teaching into the doctrinal unity of the Confession, a mode which had for some time been preferred by Melanchthon, approaching the Catholic point of view. Even more reprehensible than this attempt at innovation in a Romanizing sense, was the change which he made the 10th art. 'de coena domini,' suffer." This is simply a rehash of the calumnies of 300 years ago, and reveals the lack of scholarly investigation on the part of the writer. Dr Jacobs, who, we know, has made thorough investigation on this point, writes, p. 289: "The changes made by Melanchthon in the so-called *Variata* or 'altered' Augsburg Confession of 1540 occasioned much controversy. The changes were not intended to express a change in the conviction of the author and of the teaching of the Church, but like other changes in the same document set forth more recently approved church definitions. The *Variata* has condensed within it on other articles material confessionally stated in the Apology when the objections of the Roman theologians had been stated in the *Confutation*. The change of *distribuantur* into *exhibeantur* had been made already in the Apology, and been ratified by the Wittenberg Concord of 1536."

Dr. Stellhorn, of Columbus, a competent authority, writes, p. 422: "It was maintained that, in the article concerning the free will [in the Saxon Confession], he had yielded to the Papists, and in that concerning the Lord's Supper to the Calvinists; but an accurate investigation will not approve of such a judgment."

It is an undeniable fact that the *Variata* was read and approved by Luther; was officially used at the diets of Worms and Regensburg in

1540, '41, '46; and was not challenged by any Protestant so long as Luther and Melanchthon lived.

Taken as a whole, this article is not up to date, and does not justify the expectations raised by the Editors, pp. VI., 558.

The article on *Pietism* by the same author is much more satisfactory.

3. On p. 40, Dr. Weidner reckons "*receptive faith*" to infants, and "*personal faith*" to adults. Is not all saving faith *receptive*? Is it not also personal? Our infant faith friends get themselves into more difficulties than they get their followers out of. Not infrequently they make an ambiguous word, sometimes italicized, often of doubtful applicability, count for argument in their discussions. Dr. Weidner ought to have told us that infant faith is not a confessional doctrine, and that it does not have the consent of modern Lutheran theologians.

4. On p. 43, Dr. Weidner makes "the threefold action of applying the water at the recitation of the words," one of the things "necessary to constitute a valid baptism." It would seem that there is something new even in the old Lutheran theology. We have looked a little into the teaching of our Church on the form of baptism, but we never before saw it taught as Lutheran that "the threefold act of applying the water," is "necessary to constitute a valid baptism." Our Church has always held that the mode of applying the water is an *adiaphoron*. Gerhard names "water, the word and the action," as "the three essential parts of baptism." Dr. Weidner must have been reading John of Damascus while preparing to write this article.

5. On page 102, we read: "The Church is a divinely instituted society for the administration of the Word and sacraments." This sounds very like some modern definitions of the Church as an institution of salvation, an organism. It leaves out the fundamental idea of the Church as "the congregation of believers" (Augsb. Conf., Art. VII.), "holy believers" (Schmalkald Art. XII). Let us read into the definition given in the article before us the inspired conception of the Church: "Christ loved the society for the administration of the Word and sacrament," etc. Not even in the interest of Church Polity can we improve on Art. VII. of the Confession.

6. On p. 126, we find a very inadequate description of Private Confession. That in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries such confession was "auricular," in the sense of being spoken into the ear of the minister; that it was private in the sense of sequestered, *unter vier Augen*; that such confession was required as a condition of admission to the Lord's Supper, is simply demonstrable. This may be a shadowy part of our history, but it is a part of it, and aught to be told by ourselves rather than be left for others to tell.

7. The article by Prof. Graeber, on Conversion, p. 136, is characterized by confusion and contradiction, rather than by clearness and consistency of thought. It is essentially a revival of the Augustinian determinism. It makes conversion "solely and entirely an act of God,"

and holds that man is purely *passive* in conversion. Man can resist the means of grace, but he cannot accept the gift of salvation; as if the natural power to resist precludes the ability to accept under grace?

The article on the same subject by Dr. Stellhorn is more scriptural, but is not free from objections. "Conversion is an act which man is required to do, if he wants to be saved, and at the same time something that when the gospel is preached to him, he can do." So far, so good. Then the author describes conversion as "an act of God," and as "an act of man." So far, so good again. But he fails to tell us clearly that the word "act" must be used in different senses.

We conceive that in conversion God acts and man acts, but they act in different ways,—God as antecessor, giver, performs an *enabling* act. Man as receiver, under grace, performs an *accepting* act, an act determined by his own will, *die innere Willensentscheidung des Menschen*, as Luthardt phrases it. Both of these writers are too much hampered by the old scholastic philosophy. In repentance and conversion the final act of decision is by the will of man. Even to cease to resist requires a decision of the will. There is probably no subject on which the modern Lutheran theologians have more thoroughly modified the old dogmatical standpoint than on that of conversion. (See Luthardt's *Dogmatik*, 7th Ed., 225).

8. On p. 257, Dr. Gerberding says that "regeneration wrought by the spirit [does he mean the Holy Spirit?] through the means of grace is unto faith" We have always thought that "regeneration wrought by the Spirit" is unto holiness, moral renovation, sanctification. Faith is not an end in itself. In the Lutheran system it is simply an instrument. But a more serious objection is that here, and in the article on Regeneration (Dr. Stellhorn, p. 406), regeneration is made to precede justification. This is an inversion and a perversion of the Lutheran order of salvation. "Faith is a divine work in us which transforms and regenerates us from God," says Luther in the Preface to Romans. "Faith brings the Holy Spirit and creates a new life in hearts," says Melanchthon.

This inversion of the order of salvation did not appear in the Lutheran Church until the doctrine of "baptismal regeneration" was thrust into the place of the fourth article, and justification was pushed towards the periphery (See Luthardt, *Dogmatik*, 7th Ed., 285, and Dorner's *Hist. Prot. Theol.*, II., 158, *et seqq.*), and made to take an inferior place. It is inconsistent and illogical to speak of justification as "the fundamental, or principal doctrine," and then postpone it to some other doctrine, or to say that it is comprehended under some other doctrine. Certainly it is contradictory to say in the same breath, p. 406, that "the terms regeneration and conversion are synonymous. The difference between the two may be expressed in this way," etc. When the terms that describe things are synonymous, how can the things be different? There must be confusion somewhere.

In Dr. Jacobs' part of the article on justification, p. 258, it is said: "It (faith) is a personal relation between man and God through Christ." Is it not more correct to say that faith (subjective faith) *establishes* and *maintains* "a personal relation between man and God through Christ"? Again: "Doctrines and precepts appeal to faith and require it." Doctrines and precepts appeal to the rational and moral personality, and demand faith and obedience. This is so whether they be addressed to the regenerate or to the unregenerate.

9. On p. 331, Muhlenberg's relations with non-Lutheran Christians are glossed rather than stated. That Muhlenberg, in writing and "by word of mouth," invited Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Baptist clergymen and their members to attend the dedication of Zion's Church in Philadelphia; that he gave them the best places in the church; that Dr. Peters preached; that M. addressed the visitors as "Catholic spirited Embassadors of Christ"; that he held *Kanzelgemeinschaft* with Whitfield—these are simple matters of official record. Why should these facts be concealed under the observation: "He knew how to combine width of view and cordially of friendship towards those of other communions, with strict adherence to principle"?

10. On pp. 466-7, is an anonymous article which closes thus: "It (the Stuttgart Confession) taught real presence, oral manducation, sacramental union, ubiquity of Christ, participation of unbelievers, in real agreement with the Augs. Conf. and Lutheran teaching." We do not wonder that the author of this article hides his head under anonymity. But we wonder how the editors came to admit the last ten words of that sentence. Oral manducation is neither named nor hinted at in the Augs. Conf., nor can it be shown to be an essential part of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper (see Krauth's *Conservative Reformation*, p. 461-6). It is well known that Melanchthon modified Luther's doctrine of oral manducation at Marburg in 1529, and that he abandoned the doctrine of ubiquity in 1531. The authors of the Form of Concord clashed with each other on the subject of ubiquity. Volipresence, or multivolipresence, has been the prevailing Lutheran conception. If the reader will strike out the last ten words of this cyclopedia article, he will have a correct description of the Stuttgart Confession.

We have thus indicated, rather than criticized, a few of the many points to which attention might be directed. We incidentally noted the following items as we read: P. 165, "Sheier" for Speier, and 1227 for 1527; 211, "Richard" for Richards; 462, The University of Wittenberg was founded in 1502, not in "1500"; 431, "Verified" for versified; 452, Did Lazarus Spengler represent Nurenberg at Augsburg in 1530?; 528, Was Calov a professor at Leipzig?; 340, Is there such a thing as an ecumenical creed? The Nicene Creed is not common to the Greek and Latin Churches in the same form. The *filioque* is one of the grounds of the great schism. The Apostles' Creed and the so-called Athanasian Creed have never had official recognition in the Eastern

churchs; 465, 4th l. from the top, "1539" for 1550: 545, Melanchthon should have been named as the author of the *Wittenberg Concord*; 409, the bracketed paragraph at the end of the article on Reuchlin should be omitted. Melanchthon received his classical training from John Unger and George Simler, not from Reuchlin; 291, Luther "reached Coburg," April 15th, not April 23rd, and returned to Wittenberg, not to "Augsburg," Oct. 13th; 381, Spener was in Dresden five years, not fifteen; 30, 2nd col., l. 17 from top of page, "prescription" for proscription; 308, 2nd col., 7th l. from bottom of page, "observant monks" for obsecrant monks; 26, 1st col., l. 13, "neglects" for rejects; 223, 2nd col., it was a mistake to write that "the Luth. Publication Society makes a biennial appropriation of \$500" to the Lutheran Historical Society. Such an amount was appropriated in 1895, but none since; 266, Did not Dr. Spaeth fall from charity, when he stigmatized "American Lutheranism" as "shallow, unprincipled"? But we are glad to find at last a General Council theologian (Mr. Haas) declaring, p. 21, that "communion of saints" in the Apostles' Creed did not originally mean "congregation of saints," as Luther interpreted it in the Large Catechism. Mr. Haas is right, and Luther was wrong.

J. W. RICHARD.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.]

Theologia Pectoris: Outlines of Religious Faith Founded on Intuition and Experience. By James Muscutt Hodgson, M. A., D. Sc., D. D., Principal of the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churuhes of Scotland. Edinburg. T. and T. Clark. pp. 207. Price \$1.40.

This book belongs rather to the department of Apologetics than of Dogmatics. It is an attempt to commend, upon the authority of reason, some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. As stated by the author, "the standpoint is one which discards the conception of any purely objective authority." But having proved the subjective origin and warrant of faith in God, and of belief in divine revelation and inspiration, "the guidance of the inspired writers may be gratefully accepted and the truths they teach will be found to commend themselves to the intelligence and to the moral and spiritual faculties of sincere and earnest thinkers." This tentative position is the only true one for the Apologist, but it seems to be final with our author. When treating of the nature of inspiration he says: "The final appeal of all moral, spiritual and religious matters is to our personal intuitive perception and appreciation of the true and right, the good and divine. Truth cannot be imposed upon the mind by any external authority." "To its claims each one is bound to be loyal in so far as the truth manifested commends itself to his own mind and heart and conscience." He holds, accordingly, that the true foundation for a system of theology is the nature, condition and needs of man, that from these we must find out what is

the ideal condition towards which his spiritual faculties point, and then proceed to consider what has been provided outside of himself as means of attaining what he was meant to be. In discerning the nature of man he maintains forcibly that we have spiritual as well as intellectual and moral faculties, and that the religious is as certainly an element of our being as any other factor in it. He shows that sin has had a perverting influence and made a supernatural help necessary. We need redemption, but that redemption consists in setting up new motions and bringing new stimuli to our native powers.

This position is decidedly Pelagianizing. In his theory of the mediation of Christ he repudiates the doctrine as taught by Anselm, and denies all claims of law and justice in the atonement. "The work of Christ as mediator was to declare to us the Father's love and to convince us of his forgiving grace that was seeking to win and save us from our sin and misery." He abandons the Protestant doctrine of justification by faith. To justify, in the New Testament, means "that the believer is really and truly righteous though not in the sense of being actually and practically free from all sin and possessed of all virtue." "Believers in Christ are counted righteous by God because they are right in spirit." The conclusion to which such conceptions of divine truth tend is best given in the author's own words: "The complete establishment of the kingdom of heaven upon earth will be realized when true brotherly fellowship and coöperation among all who own each other as Christ's disciples are unfettered and all embracing, purged from arbitrary conditions, from all that is formal, traditional and stereotyped, and degraded no longer by prescribed forms and authoritative regulations; when all vestiges of sacerdotalism, sacramentalism and ecclesiastical authority have been got rid of; when universal prevalence of catholicity and charity has put an end to the intolerance of differences whether in opinions, forms of worship or methods of Christian enterprise, when all are content cordially to recognize every Christian brother, and practically to admit that to his own Master he standeth or falleth."

The book will be very helpful to those who want to become acquainted with the trend of theological thought in the Calvinistic Churches in Scotland. It will be of great service also to those who have to deal with skepticism as it exists among the educated in business circles. The busy pastor will find here in a small compass many valuable suggestions as to the positions to be taken and the arguments to be used. The time has come when the minister must preach evidence, not from the pulpit, but in personal work, and he must prepare himself from books like this which deal with fundamental philosophic principles.

L. A. FOX.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York].

Our Lord's Illustrations. One of a series of Bible Class Primers, edited by Principal Salmond, D. D., of Aberdeen. This volume by Rev. Robert R. Resker, King's College, London. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. Paper cover. Illustrated. 136 pp. 20 cents net. In this little volume, the author has gathered together and classified all the metaphors, emblems, and incidents, and allusions, employed by our Lord to illustrate his teachings. Every reference to objects in nature, to civil, social, or domestic life, to occupations and customs, as well as to Old Testament history, is explained. Such a work is as necessary to intelligent Bible reading, as is a Bible dictionary to critical study. For, to give these illustrations a nineteenth-century setting, is often to miss the real meaning and run a risk of falling into error. The teacher, in particular, will find here fresh thought and helpful material for added interest in the familiar sayings of Jesus.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York].

The Autobiography and Diary of Samuel Davidson, D. D., LL. D. Edited by his Daughter. pp. 350. Price \$3.00.

Here is an intensely stimulating revelation of mind and heart. Dr. Davidson's diary was not commenced until he was sixty-seven years of age. This probably accounts for its meager and impressionistic quality in the earlier chapters. It is the sketchy memorabilia of an acute and scholarly student of hermeneutics, who commenced his career as an orthodox Presbyterian, of Irish birth (1806), was made uncomfortable by Calvinistic illiberality of thought, entered the Congregationalist body and became a professor of Hebrew and Biblical Criticism at Lancashire College. By reason of his views of the composite nature of the Pentateuch he was compelled to resign his position despite his declared belief in and warm attachment to all the essential truths of the Christian faith. His German training and intimacy with Tholuck, Neander, Hupfeld, Tischendorf, Bunsen, DeWette, Kalisch, and later, with Pfeiderer of Berlin, at once declares the reality and thoroughness of his scholarship and the plan of his work in Biblical study. His translations from the German and his own well-known introductions to the Old and New Testaments are known to all students. He was a man of positive and aggressive spirit. In this diary he reveals his gradual departure from his orthodox positions of 1848, and his final entrance into the camp of the rationalistic theologians. His piety remained unaffected by his change of view, and he contended for Christian truth, as he understood it, to the last. The autobiography was inspired by a request of his beloved wife, whose loss sounds like a pathetic note through the volume. He died in 1898, at 91 years of age. Dr. Davidson has set down many valuable opinions upon politics, religion, war, the Church, ancient ver-

sions, and Church history, but his later naturalistic interpretations of Scripture though forceful and brilliant, are expressed as results and *obiter dicta* rather.

E. H. DELK.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.]

Reconciliation by Incarnation. By Principal D. W. Simon, D. D. pp. 380. Price 3.00

If theology consists simply in the gathering of proof-texts for the buttressing of certain creeds and confessions, then this book will not satisfy the average dogmatician. But if theology is first and foremost the systematic erection of biblical thought into the crowning expression of God's world-plan and work for man, then this book of Principal Simon's must be classed among the finest pieces of Christian thinking which has appeared in either England or America for a decade. It may be well to say as a first word that the author of this book was a pupil of Dorner's and is the translator of his great teacher's monumental work, *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*.

Dr. Simon first devotes himself to a statement of the cosmological background of the Incarnation. The need and significance of the Atonement, he thinks, is rather ignored, or misunderstood, because there is no true cosmology presented by many theologians. He places as ultimate factors of the universe-matter, energy and idea (divine plan and laws). He then presents the diversified expressions of the one energy, the idea and its differentiations, and matter and its forms. The author is a theistic evolutionist, but finds a place for a distinct fall of man. Indeed the one great worth of the whole book is in that recognition of the assured results of the best modern anthropology, psychology and ethics in happy balance with the great central truths of biblical teaching concerning the constitution, sin and recovery of man through the energizing of God's redemptive life in Christ. Some idea of the fresh method of statement may be gathered in his chapter on "God as the Environment of man." The relation is a twofold one, says the author. First, "personal," arising out of the cosmological relation of creator to his creature, and secondly, a "bio-dynamic" relation—a vital energizing of the spiritual nature of man, which may be rejected or accepted. The conditioning of this relation is fully presented in chapter VI. of the book. "The Normal Relation between God and Man," and "The Actual relation of Man to God," are found in the two subsequent chapters. Now we approach the heart of Principal Simon's study. Concerning the actual fall of man, he says: "The first mistake frequently made is in exaggerating, not the *significance*, but the *heinousness* of the sin committed by the first man. The older Protestant idea that the first man was created not only free from corruption, but possessed and used all inborn perfections of intellect, will, heart and

body; the enjoyment of the blessedness of a perfect paradise; wisdom, sanctity, knowledge, perfect love of God; health, symmetry, and beauty of soul, dominion over nature, impassibility and immortality of body and soul," is modified in the light of recent study, not in the interest of minimizing the *significance* of sin, but in lessening the idea of the *heinousness* of the first man's deviation from the ideal cosmological and personal relation of God to man. A second mistake is made, thinks our author, in treating *heathenism* prior to the advent of Christ and the heathenism since Christ,—especially that which has remained entrenched by Christian influences,—as identical. A third mistake frequently made is that of "ascribing to *individual* members of the race what is true of the *race as a whole*." A fourth confusion mentioned is that of "identifying every *actual* sin with the *ideal* of sin."

The results of the abnormal personal relation of man to God are next discussed. God is involved in man's abnormal relation. A deistic or pantheistic God would not be seriously affected by man's sin, but out of the personal and vital relation which God should sustain in every life springs the sad rift in the lute made by sin. "In place of shedding on him the light of his countenance, and letting him taste of the sweetness of his friendship; instead of trusting and honoring him, God's face is hidden, and he lets him feel his displeasure, his resentment, yea, even his anger and wrath. Both in God's transcendent and immanent relation man's sin has caused a break in the plan and inflow of the divine energy. "Whether the condemnation be termed legal or judicial, or governmental or moral, does not touch the point. In any and every case God regards man in a light, and treats him in a manner, contrary to his own original ideas; in other words, a change admitting of the designation abnormal must be said to have been brought about in God's personal relation to man, through the change in man's personal relation to God." God must therefore make a demand of man. "Refusal—on whatever ground—to require the fulfillment of moral obligations outlaws a man as really as refusal to fulfill them when required. *To claim the performance of duty*—of course, in the right way—is as truly *obligatory* as it is *obligatory to perform the duty which is prescribed*." After discussing the older legal and forensic conception of God's relation, he thus states his own point of view: "Let it be repeated that the legal relation of God to man, though abnormal, is righteous, nay more, is personally, that is, ethically necessary."

The first movement toward reconciliation is taken by God to restore the ideal order. "God must bring home to the human mind his judgment of sin." Humanity on the other hand must find its representative to express its grief and satisfaction for broken fellowship. Humanity alone must despair of this fulfillment. The potential man must be made the actual man—the true image of God. Through chapters illuminating and made forceful by literary and scriptural illustration, the learned author expatiates the problem of the rapprochement of man and God.

The last section of the book, *The Incarnation of the Divine Word*, brings us to the solution of the problem. It is hardly necessary for me to report that Simon's conception of the Incarnation does not stop with the idea that the entrance of The Eternal Logos was merely a cosmological fulfilment of the divine unfolding in humanity. It was that, but something far more. On the way to his conception he makes a study of our Lord's Kenosis—the limitation of divine power and knowledge in order to live in the actual human environment. He is a full believer in the Virgin birth as declared by Matthew and Luke. "The Son of God subjected himself also to human limitations with regard to the *store of energy* which thus constituted him." His relation to man is thus strikingly set forth. "He condemned them with a divine condemnation, or rather freely entered into the divine condemnation which was constantly being pronounced on them. As the things referred to rose above the horizon of consciousness, the first effect naturally must have been a feeling as if they were his own, and as if he therefore were himself under accusation and condemnation." This sense of oneness in grief and transgression springing out of his identification with humanity culminated in his death upon the cross. "Christ made satisfaction or amends for the dishonor done the name of God." It was no heathenish purchase of favor, but a representative filial compensation of God who had already bestowed his favor. Thus the vindication becomes essentially ethical, not merely legal. Thus the bio-dynamic task of the Incarnation is completed, but it remains for individual men to appropriate the divine energy opened up in Christ Jesus. This is accomplished through certain channels—the Church, the Word and the Sacraments, and is evidenced in the exalted consciousness of the Christian people.

It is a propitious sign of the times that such work is being written and read by thoughtful men. The author acknowledges his indebtedness to Drs. Orr, Illingworth, Dorner, but is as genuinely original and profound as his collaborators in Christological thinking. *Reconciliation by Incarnation* is a book for which I have long been waiting, and is as stimulating reading for the preacher as for the theologian. Such reading breeds power.

E. H. DELK.

[Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.]

The Exiles' Book of Consolation (Isaiah 40-66). By Ed. König. M. A., D. D., Professor at the University of Rostock, Translated by Rev. J. A. Selbie, M. A. pp. VI., 218.

The questions connected with the unity, the date and place of composition have not yet been finally answered. The discussion is still on. The critics are much divided. There are those who affirm that the Ebed-Tahuch passages, their rhythm, diction and isolation necessitate a partition of Deutero-Isaiah, others contend that the prophecies contained in this portion of the book are partially post-exilic, still others, that

they are wholly post-exilic. The more conservative writers claim that chapters 40-66 were written during the captivity. To this class Prof. König belongs. He of course denies the Isaianicity of Deutero-Isaiah, but he also objects to the post-exilic view. He occupies a middle ground. In the volume before us he reviews the arguments on these points of Sellin, Ley, Lane, Gressman and others, and in some instances makes complete answers to them. In chapter IV., our author gives a synopsis of his part of Isaiah under three divisions: "The Sovereignty of Israel's God over Nature and History; The Extension of God's Salvation by Israel to the end of the earth; and The Recompensing of the Righteous and the Wicked. Here the writer appears at his best. His style is simple, his thoughts thrill and inspire. The book exhibits throughout discrimination and fairness in dealing with the opponent's arguments. We cannot, however, restrain the thought, that some of the objections which the Professor urges against the post-exilic date of composition, lie with equal force against the exilic date, and could be marshalled with little change in favor of the old traditional view, that the entire book is the product of one master mind, and that mind the sublime prophet Isaiah. A copious list of Scripture passages, quoted in the discussion, follows at the end of the volume.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Great Sinners of the Bible. By Louis Albert Banks, D. D. Cloth bound. pp. 329. \$1.50.

This book contains a series of Sunday night sermons, furnished by the author at the request of the publisher. Dr. Banks seems to have solved successfully the problem of the evening service. The solution will be evident to the reader. The sermons are short, pithy, and personal; not preached to please or attract, but aimed at the conscience of the hearer. The volume contains twenty-eight character-sketches, mostly from the Old Testament. By his clear insight into human nature and his rare faculty of delineating the struggles of the heart, the author has succeeded in putting sin and its sorrows into concrete and tangible form. The characteristics which have made Dr. Banks's former works so popular are here preserved; and the sermons abound with illustrations and quotations of great merit.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK; CURTS AND JENNINGS, CINCINNATI.

Sin. By Randolph S. Foster, D. D., LL. D. A Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Price \$3.00.

In this work Dr. Foster's STUDIES IN THEOLOGY has reached its sixth volume. The object of the series is to furnish in condensed form the best thought of the most learned and able thinkers in the depart-

ments of philosophy and theology, and the results of the author's own investigation and study. The aim is to help toward a settlement of obscure and disputed points.

The present volume, like those before it, handles the difficult problems in the subject with ability and vigor. It divides the discussion under the heads of Adam, Inclusions of the Creative Act, What is Sin? Guilt, and Punishment. The author is strongly anti-Augustinian and anti-Calvinistic. As to Adam, he holds him to have been created in integrity, with rich and ample endowments, but the endowments were those of faculty—not of concreated treasures of actual knowledge. The creative act is viewed as setting him forth in innocence, and with a bodily and mental constitution in which it was "natural to move freely along the course of joyful obedience and worshipful love." But this did not constitute him righteous. A distinction is claimed between a "moral nature" and a "moral character"—the latter being held to be attainable only by the free action of Adam himself. "Holiness is a quality of a person, resulting from and determinable by a free conformity to a righteous law." With respect to sin, its origin is credited to Adam's misuse of his free-will under temptation. It was his personal act—according to the common faith of the Church. But Dr. Foster carries the principle that personal action is the sphere of sin forward to the question of sin in Adam's posterity and repudiates the applicability of the term sin to natural depravity. He rejects the expressions "inherited sin," "transmitted sin," and the like. He repudiates Pelagianism, and maintains the *fact* of human depravity or corruption, and that it is a result or *consequence* of the Adamic transgression, but that as it comes to men from a source back of their free agency it cannot be in itself sin nor constitute guilt. Sin and guilt exist only when conditions of responsible free agency are reached. In support of these views, with the theological principle and applications they imply, and against the prevalent counter teaching with its presuppositions and bearings, the great body of the discussion is directed. The discussion is conducted with great ability and force. Numerous extended statements and defenses are quoted from writers representative of the prevalent teaching, and subjected to acute, vigorous, and impressive criticism. Especially is this the case with respect to the theories of "imputation" of Adam's sin, whether based on realistic view or federal headship. Rarely have the reasons against those theories been put with such clear and effective force.

The work is largely polemic, and its strength is in its close and vigorous analysis and criticism of opposing views, rather than in constructive work. The great questions brought under consideration are of profound importance. This discussion of them is worthy of a place among the able contributions offered for their settlement. Dr. Foster has extended his examination of the place and relations of punishment so as to include its bearings on the doctrine of the atonement. His under-

standing of these bearings leads him decline the satisfaction theory, while in harmony with Wesleyan Methodism, he accepts the Arminian governmental view of the atonement.

It is proper to note a mistake of Dr. Foster in this connection, when he speaks of "the Lutheran position in maintains a doctrine of atonement which, with it universality, must save all men, and which is disproved by the fact that many are not saved." He has misread the Lutheran theology on this point.

M. VALENTINE.

Enemies and Evidences of Christianity. Thoughts on Questions of the Hour. By John Duncan Quackenbos. Columbia University, Author of "History of Oriental and Classical Literature." pp. 355. Price \$1.50.

Prof. Quackenbos did worthy service when he prepared and delivered at Newburg-on-Lake Sunape, New Hampshire, the addresses whose substance is gathered into the twelve chapters of this volume. He has added a larger service in giving them to the public in the present form. For the discussions are "timely and able, as well characterized by Dr. Sabine in his introduction to the book. The prompting occasion for them is found in the wide and blighting prevalence of religious unrest and error, in which, in our unsettled times, thousands on thousands of persons are led off into absurd un-Christian and pagan follies. There is great need of this trenchant exposure of the wild insanity and demoralizing effect upon personal and social life, from the agnostic, infidel, superstitious, theosophic and heathen substitutes for the Christian faith, now doing their unhappy work.

The first chapter showing the pre-eminent claims of Christianity is followed by chapters impressively laying bare the absurdity of turning away from it to the guidance of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Mohammedanism, Theosophy, Spiritism, Christian Science, Socialistic Communism, Altruism or Socio-Commercial Love, Agnosticism, with a closing chapter on the Christian Evidences. Prof. Quackenbos writes out of a scholarly acquaintance with the religious as well as the scientific thought of our day, and with great vigor of thought and expression. His discussions cut sharply and deeply into multiform types of prevalent and irrational vagaries. We cannot but think that he has made undue concession to the use and value of hypnotism as a means of physical and moral healing. But even on this his suggestions are interesting. We desire to commend the book. It ought to have a wide reading.

M. VALENTINE.

The Foundations of Christian Faith. By Charles W. Rishell, A. M., Ph. D., Prof. of Historical Theology in Boston University School of Theology. Price \$3.50.

This is the latest volume of the *Library of Biblical and Theological Literature*, edited by Drs. George R. Crooks and John F. Hurst, a se-

ries of works which has received wide favor, intended to furnish a compendious apparatus for advanced theological study. The eight earlier volumes include such works as Prof. Harman's *Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures*; Dr. Terry's *Biblical Hermeneutics*; Crooks and Hurst's *Theological Encyclopedia and Methodology*; Dr. Bennett's *Christian Archæology*; Dr. Miley's *Systematic Theology*, etc. Dr. Rishell's work fully sustains the recognized rank of the series.

The work is distinctly apologetic, and furnishes a vindication of the divine claims of Christianity against the various forms of recent and present skeptical and opposing thought. It does not attempt any novel theory of Christian defense, but what is far better and more serviceable, a review of the various forms and anaphrases of adverse contention, and a presentation of the fully satisfactory answers as required by the completest investigations and best sustained conclusions now reached in religious, philosophical, and scientific knowledge. It is thus a compendious exhibition of the failure of skepticism to justify its objections, and of the positive evidences of the truth of Christianity, as they stand in the best thought of our day.

The method of the work is happily adapted to this aim. After an introduction defining the terms Knowledge, Belief, Faith, and Unbelief, the author reviews the philosophical forms of unbelief, Materialism, Atheism, Agnosticism, Pantheism or Monism, the conflicts between scientists and theologians with respect to creation and miracles, the mythical theory of the Gospels, and the various proposed ethical and other substitutes for Christianity. He passes to the more positive view of the claims of Christianity in discussing its doctrines concerning both man and God, the nature and fact of supernatural revelation, the evidential value of miracles, the resurrection of Christ, the superiority and finality of this revelation, and the satisfactory test which it finds in experience and Christian consciousness. The scope of the work is very comprehensive, covering almost every form of recent skeptical thought. The discussion is calm, frank and fair. The author shows himself masterfully at home in the various departments of knowledge and thought required for effective and assuring presentation of the truth. The work is prevailingly marked by clear thinking and just judgment. It abounds in fine examples of discriminating analysis and clear-cut logic. A feature of value is found in the large reference to recent authors on the subject.

The underlying theology of the volume, as understood for this series of the *Biblical and Theological Library*, conforms essentially to the standards of the Methodist Episcopal Church. But the discussion rests on the fundamental Christian views acceptable to all evangelical Churches. Prof. Rishell is keenly alive to scientific progress and to biblical criticism. As far as he yields to them, he regards them as not destroying, but confirming the ground of the Christian apologist. His

volume is a timely and most valuable contribution to our apologetic literature.

M. VALENTINE.

Honey from Many Hives. Gathered by Rev. James Mudge, D. D. pp. 328. \$1.00.

The contents of this book are accurately described by the title. It is a volume of extracts from the works of some of the best devotional writers of the Christian Church, with a prefatory chapter by Dr. Mudge on Devotional Reading. Thomas á Kempis, Francis de Sales, Thomas C. Upham, F. W. Faber, Jeremy Taylor, Samuel Rutherford are among the writers represented, and the selection from their books and from those of others scarcely less eminent for their spiritual insight and clear statement, have been made with admirable judgment. They are eminently calculated to instruct, admonish, console and cheer. It is a book to be kept close at hand for daily reading, and will doubtless find its way, as it ought, into the homes of many who are desiring a larger, fuller life.

M. H. VALENTINE.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Development of English Thought: A Study in the Economic Interpretation of History. By Simon M. Patten, Ph. D., Professor of Political Economy, Wharton School of Finance and Economy, University of Pennsylvania. pp. 328. \$3.00.

This book is an attempt to present the theory of history through concrete illustrations, and English history is chosen for the purpose because the circumstances isolating England have made her development more uniform than that of her continental neighbors.

The theory on which the discussion proceeds is briefly this: 'there are two groups of ideas, knowledge or sensory ideas brought by the the senses from the environment, and action or motor ideas revealing the self struggling for those relations, to objective things that insure survival.' Out of this action and reaction comes the development in thought, institutions and economic conditions. At the basis of race differentiation are climatic causes. Irregular climatic conditions, with uncertain food supplies and rainfall, tend to foster the passive qualities; better and more settled conditions develop self-reliance and aggressiveness. Among the antecedents of English thought, as it has taken concrete shape in institution and society, these effects of material environment are put first. Then follows an analysis of the influence of the Catholic supremacy, of inventions, of changes in diet and clothing, domicile, and labor, and of the dislocation of old associations and relations introduced by the Reformation. As these successive changes came in they produced new motor reactions, or utilized old ones which had been created by previous efforts to insure survival through adjustment to environment, but which were no longer called to act in the old way because the altered environment had obviated the need for them. The

development is then traced through Calvinism, the philosophy of Hobbes, Locke, Mandeville, Hume, Adam Smith, the Methodist revival—all together preparing the way for the more recent economists Malthus, Ricardo, and John Stuart Mill. Darwin, the Oxford movement, and the poets are also related by the author to the development he is seeking to trace, and through this complexity of factors he brings the discussion down to the present with the problems that yet await solution.

The specially unsatisfactory thing in the underlying theory of this book is that it is too mechanical. It approaches very closely to Locke's original denial of innate ideas, and his affirmation that the mind is a *tabula rasa*, and that in a rationally governed man expression should be the exact equivalent of impression. This theory is indeed combatted, and it is shown that Locke himself was forced to modify this extreme position in order to account for the manifest excess of expression over impression, by admitting that reflection on materials furnished by experience gives rise to ideas that have "nothing to do with external objects." Still the relation between sensory and motor action is pressed so vigorously that there is too little conceded to mental initiative to account for the differentiation that has taken place in the development of English thought and economic life. The assertion that sensory powers are modified by heredity is avoiding the problem rather than solving it. The gist of the argument comes out in such statements as these: "Character is formed by the motor reactions which are created by the perception of certain sensory ideas. These motor reactions are the result of hereditary adjustments," p. 12. "The basis of race ideals is the motor reactions that peculiar conditions have produced and heredity continued." "A migrating race will have a more marked national character than a settled race. Passing through more environments the limiting aggregates of each will leave their influence on the national character in the motor reactions they create" p. 18. In case of change of environments, where the limiting aggregate is absent or shows itself in different forms, "we have an inherited motor mechanism without any means of exciting it," p. 19. Development comes through the response of this old motor reaction to a new group of sensory ideas, p. 51.

In harmony with the general drift of the book the conclusions of the associational philosophy of Bain, Mill, and Spencer are accepted as explaining the origin of moral ideas, p. 269. As over against a stable, intuitional and universal morality we have the following: "Morals might be defined as the application of the philosophic deductions of one age to the economic conditions of later ages. We might say that morals are rationalized customs, habits and traditions," p. 266. "Few, if any, ideas are universal. Religious, political, and social ideas

of any sort meet insuperable barriers as soon as they reach the limits of the environment in which they were produced," p. 49.

Another serious defect in this book is a failure to estimate the profound significance of man's religious nature, and the appeals that are addressed to it. The view here presented of the Lutheran Reformation, of the Calvinistic movement in England, and of the Methodist revival, is wholly superficial, dropping out some of their most characterizing features. As an example of the way religious processes are dealt with the view presented of conversion serves well. After speaking on pp. 18 and 19 of conversion in general, as any change of ideas, and tracing the phenomenon to a new sensory stimulus appealing to old and unused motor reactions, the author, in speaking of the Wesleyan revival, makes this specific application of his theory to conversion as a religious phenomenon: "Suppressed tendencies or disused motor reactions are the key to the phenomenon of conversion," p. 258.

But while we are unable to agree with some of the presuppositions of this book, or accept its interpretation of many historical, moral and religious movements, we wish to say that it is a book both learned and suggestive. We are much impressed with the method followed, and believe that if a more profound grasp of the elements guided the working of it, it would yield substantial and affirmative conclusions. Dr. Patten has a fine gift for expository writing, his analysis of the views of Locke, Hume, Mandeville, Smith and others, being both acute and luminous. Whether one agrees or disagrees with him it is an intellectual stimulus to follow him through these learned and closely reasoned pages.

M. H. VALENTINE.

MACMILLAN AND COMPANY, 66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. By Marvin R. Vincent, D. D. pp. 185.

This book is just what its title imports—a history of Textual Criticism. The author shows complete mastery of the subject in hand, and has used his material in the most skillful manner. The scholar will find nothing new in the book, except the order and the way of putting things. But the scholar will be glad to have the facts of Textual Criticism placed before him in such a convenient and readable form. The busy pastor, or casual Bible student, will find quite enough here to make him well acquainted with the subject. The teacher of New Testament Textual Criticism may profitably adopt this as his text-book. The numerous fac-simile specimens of manuscripts, and of printed pages, of the New Testament, add to the interest and intelligibility of the discussions.

The book is a valuable addition to the "New Testament Hand-books" series edited by Shaler Mathews of the University of Chicago.

J. W. RICHARD.

PLEMING H. REVELL CO., CHICAGO, NEW YORK, TORONTO.

Christian Missions and Social Progress. A Sociological Study of Foreign Missions. By Rev. James S. Dennis, D. D. Vol. II., 8vo., pp. viii., 486. Illustrated. Price, \$2.50.

This is a monumental work. It has outgrown the author's prospectus, for with the second volume comes the announcement of the third. The first volume was largely apologetic, advancing to a critical study of the evils of the non-Christian world. It turns out that his catalogue was itself a prospectus of what the author had in store, of proof and illustration, for the present volume. The inability of paganism to lift itself, the failure of the ethnic religions and a brilliant chapter on Christianity, the social hope of the nations, concluded volume I.

The second volume presents the effects in detail of mission work in transforming the character, ideas and habits of pagan peoples, and considers the direct contribution in social progress thus reached in the sphere of individual character, family life and philanthropy. The reader has presented to him a volume of testimony which is simply amazing. The work of almost every missionary station on the face of the globe is cited. Every possible phase of human improvement is catalogued, with the direct testimony on the subject. The work of every missionary society in the world is touched upon. We look into the faces of our own Kaiserswerth Deaconesses in Syria. The work of missions in the line of education is evidently reserved for the third volume.

The book is profusely illustrated with full-page reproductions of original photographs. It is a pity that a work so voluminous, so well calculated to become a hand-book in every minister's library, is without an index in each volume. Copious indexes are promised with the third volume, however.

H. C. ALLEMAN.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK AND LONDON.

The Real and Ideal in Literature. By Frank Preston Stearns. pp. XIII. and 223.

This book consists of a collection of essays, some of them more or less closely related to each other, rather than a logically connected discussion of the subject. The author laments the excessive cry for realism in literature, and argues that only as the ideal shines through and illuminates the real, does a production acquire the character of the best literature. He illustrates the necessity for this element by a critical examination of some of the works of our great writers. This general matter is followed by a more particular review of the work of Frederick W. Loring (to whose memory the book is dedicated) and of Herman Grimm and Emerson. Chapters on the "Müller and Whitney Controversy," and on the "Science of Thought," in which latter the teachings

of Aristotle and Hegel with regard to logic are discussed and compared, complete the book.

It is an interesting book; and the estimate it gives of the relative importance of the real and ideal in literature and the treatment which should be accorded them is well balanced and devoid of any overweening praise of either alone. The style is good, though in some parts not so clear as might be wished. The first of the two chapters devoted to Herman Grimm furnishes the author an opportunity for a discussion of Raphael's life and work which he improves to advantage. He displays a keen appreciation of his subject, but, we regret to say, lacks at times in closeness and definiteness of treatment.

P. M. BIKLE.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, NEW YORK.

The Dutch and Quaker Colonies in America. By John Fiske. 2 vols. 1899. pp. 294-400.

These volumes follow in subject matter directly after the author's "Beginnings of New England," and they trace the various events in the history of New Netherland and the Quaker settlement of Pennsylvania. The preliminary resumé in the first two chapters covering a sketch of Dutch history and the influence of the Dutch upon English history, is most interesting, calling attention as it does to facts that throw much light on later events.

The Dutch attempts at colonization and the vicissitudes of the settlers of New Netherland, furnish a fascinating narrative. The author points out fully the fallacy of the idea that our free institutions are of Dutch rather than English origin—a theory whose demolition he seems especially to enjoy. He shows why the Dutch colony languished and suffered so long, as compared with the English settlements. He points out that the government of New Netherland was agreement "of the people, by the Director and Council, for the West India Company," a state of things that made poor soil for developing Dutch liberties. This seems to have constituted the weakness from which New Netherland suffered until it finally fell into English hands. For while already in 1628 the 300 settlers at Plymouth had their own laws and assembly and elected their own governor; and while at the same time the 4,000 widely scattered Virginians had their house of representatives "without whose consent the governor appointed by the crown could not raise so much as a penny by taxation"—the 300 inhabitants compactly placed in New Amsterdam had not so much as a town meeting—and never did have under Dutch rule. Such conditions formed the weakness of New Netherland till it finally fell into English hands.

Penn's Holy Experiment at founding a colony based on principles of self-government far in advance of his day in their liberality, forms a sharp contrast to all that precedes. Mr. Fiske gives a long account of Penn—his career and his peculiar tenets. His estimate of Penn is so high that he views his "weakest point" as being "an occasional slow-

ness in recognizing the bad side of human nature"! The volumes close with an account of the immigration of Jews, Huguenots, Scotch Irish, and Germans. An excellent index is appended.

We wish space were allowed to call attention to some of the very interesting points brought out in these volumes. We meet new facts, new view-points and suggestive theories of events under discussion. The author traces with interest the large bearing that passing and often obscure events among these isolated, disturbed, and often commonplace settlers, have had on the subsequent history of our country. The reader is led along through a fascinating tale of early days, and told a lot of things he never knew before in a way that impresses and charms. We believe many will thank Mr. Fiske for these volumes, as we are here glad to do. We feel, after their perusal, as though we had enjoyed the benefit of a special private talk from the author, an impression due no doubt to the happy style that gives us historical weight without heaviness, and a historical philosophy that does not oppress, uniting critical veracity and a keen sense of historical perspective, and spreading all before us in most vigorous and charming diction.

S. G. VALENTINE.

THE GLEASON PUBLISHING COMPANY, FREMONT, OHIO.

It Was Marlowe. A Story of the Secret of Three Centuries. By Wil-
bur Gleason Zeigler.

This book appears to have been written primarily as a romance and incidentally to support the theory that Christopher Marlowe and not Francis Bacon was the author of Shakespeare's plays. It may, perhaps, be admitted, without saying much, that as between Bacon and Marlowe we should choose the latter as the more probable author. We should be sorry, however, to convey the impression that our faith in the tradition of three centuries has been in the least disturbed by this romance. To us the story would have been more acceptable without the attachment—it can hardly be called the incorporation—of the new theory. Parts of the story are told with considerable dramatic power, some descriptions of old London are exceedingly well done and the interest of the whole is satisfactorily sustained. The rhetoric is frequently crude. The wrong word is sometimes used and the transitions from the solemn to the familiar style are often startlingly sudden.

On the first page we are told that "a man had paused to prevent overtaking the crowd"; on p. 104, occurs the sentence, "With Shakespeare were two others whose lives were inseparably interwoven with that of his own and with Marlowe's"; p. 98, tells of "amelioration of the darkness"; on p. 127, "temporary" is used for temporizing; on p. 110, we find "thou expurgated"; on p. 236, "thou art doubly welcome," addressed to two visitors; on p. 237, "What! croaking ravens, both of thee?" on p. 242, "thou should be more circumspect." These and

other errors that can hardly be blamed upon the printer or explained as colloquialisms of the characters prompt us to suggest a review of grammar and rhetoric before the next venture.

J. A. HIMES.

BERRY BROTHERS, HOMER CITY, PENNSYLVANIA.

Distinguishing Doctrines of the Evangelical Lutheran Church. By Rev. John Tomlinson, A. M. pp. 48.

In six brief, but pregnant, chapters, the author discusses "The Doctrine of Original Sin"; "The Doctrine of the Person of Christ"; "The Doctrine of the Nature and Efficacy of the Sacraments"; "The True Doctrine of Baptism"; "The True Doctrine of the Lord's Supper"; "The Doctrine of Justification by Faith."

This little book contains strong meat for men; not much milk for babes. The type of theology is chiefly that of the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century, which is good enough of its kind, but it ought to be tempered by that of the Lutheran dogmaticians of the nineteenth century, who have as good right to be heard on the subject of Lutheran doctrine as their great predecessor's of two hundred and fifty years ago. The Lutheran doctrine is not less the Lutheran doctrine when it has been expanded, fructified, enriched, by later thinking, and adapted to new conditions. As we do not live in the environment of the seventeenth century, so we cannot think in the formulae, and use the terms, of the men of the seventeenth century. The author's work is good, but it could have been made better by being made more modern. Mr. Tomlinson is known to be a fine German scholar. We wish he had incorporated into his book the fruits of the study of Thomasius, Frank, Lüthardt, *et al.* We commend the Lutheran theology most, when we present its latest legitimate developments, and make it speak the language of our own times.

J. W. RICHARD.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON, MASS.

The *Atlantic Monthly* for December contains a number of papers that are valuable; some poetical selections that are veritable gems and some pieces of fiction that are in striking contrast with much of the literature of that class which is lowering the standard of many of the magazines of this period. Among the papers that are particularly bright are "Reform by Humane Touch," by Jacob A. Riis; "Wanted, a Chair of Tent-Making," by Alfred Brown Layman, a paper which the readers of the QUARTERLY will find of special interest; "Is there a Democracy of Studies;" "Poe's Place in American Literature;" "Platonic Friendship" and "French Openmindedness." One of the strongest pieces of fiction that has appeared as a serial in any magazine is "To Have and to Hold" by Mary Johnston, now running as a serial in the *Atlantic*. It is so pure and sweet and strong that on every hand one hears only words of praise for it. We know of no magazine with so many fine

characteristics as the *Atlantic Monthly*, and, while other magazines may come and go, we hope it will go on forever.

P. M. BIKE.

PERRY MASON AND CO., BOSTON, MASS.

The Youth's Companion is growing better every year. Its stories portray the manly and womanly virtues with no sacrifice of interest, and they appeal to the sympathies of the old and young alike. During 1900 it will offer special series of stories—among them being stories of Former Political Campaigns and Adventures of Linemen. Besides these there will be a score of stories for girls by such writers as Sarah Orne Jewett, Mary E. Wilkins, Margaret Deland, Elizabeth Stuart Phelps, Edith Wharton, Kate Chapin and Margaret Sangster.

Some of the other contributors will be Frank R. Stockton, who presents a droll story, "The Wolf and the Wheelbarrow"; James Bryce author of "The American Commonwealth," who offers "Hints on Reading"; W. D. Howells and Jane Barlow, each of whom contributes a serial story; and Bret Harte, who recalls an early California experience in "How I Went to the Mines."

The *Companion* calendar for 1900 is unique in form and beautiful in design. It is suitable as an ornament for the pretiest room in the house. It will be sent to all new subscribers. Those wishing to subscribe should address *The Youth's Companion*, Boston, Mass., 203 Columbus Avenue.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

The Lutheran Almanac and Year-Book, for the Year of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, 1900 Edited by Rev. Matthias Sheeleigh, D. D. Price 10 cts. a copy or \$1.00 per dozen.

This well-known annual comes to us with all the varied information concerning the Church that has made it always so valuable. It ought to be in every Lutheran family. A pastor can serve the Church and his people well by taking steps to place a copy in every home.

KEE MAR COLLEGE AND Music and Art Conservatory,

[CHARTERED 1850.]

Offers Classic, Normal, Music and Art courses for Diploma and Degrees; comprises three large brick buildings situated on a beautiful eminence, a lovely campus, library, apparatus, hot and cold mountain water, steam heat, gas light, electric bells, a suite of rooms nicely furnished for every two or three students, music lessons on Pipe-Organ, Reed Organ, Piano, Violin, Guitar, Mandolin, Banjo, and Cornet.

Lessons in Drawing, Crayoning, Pastel, Oil and China Painting.
German and French languages taught and spoken.
Special attention paid to Elocution and Voice Culture.
Normal course with Diploma for teaching.
Strict attention given to Physical, Social and Religious Culture.
Kee Mar College is located in a most attractive, refined and healthful city of 14,000 people.
Send for catalogue and journal to

**REV. C. L. KEEDY, A. M., M. D., President,
HAGERSTOWN, MD.**



Anyone sending a sketch and description may quickly ascertain our opinion free whether an invention is patentable. Confidential. Handbook on Patents sent free. Oldest agency for securing patents.

Patents taken through Munn & Co. receive special notice, without charge, in the

Scientific American.

A handsomely illustrated weekly. Largest circulation of any scientific journal. Terms, \$3 a year; four months, \$1. Sold by all newsdealers.

MUNN & CO. 361 Broadway, New York
Branch Office, 22 F St., Washington, D. C.